



**HAL**  
open science

# Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation (SARS) and Visceral Function Outcomes in Spinal Cord Injury—A Systematic Review of the Literature Over Four Decades

Thomas Guiho, Christine Azevedo Coste, Luc Bauchet, Claire Delleci,  
Jean-Rodolphe Vignes, David Guiraud, Charles Fattal

► **To cite this version:**

Thomas Guiho, Christine Azevedo Coste, Luc Bauchet, Claire Delleci, Jean-Rodolphe Vignes, et al.. Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation (SARS) and Visceral Function Outcomes in Spinal Cord Injury—A Systematic Review of the Literature Over Four Decades. *World Neurosurgery*, 2021, 10.1016/j.wneu.2021.09.041 . hal-03375512

**HAL Id: hal-03375512**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-03375512>**

Submitted on 13 Oct 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## **Title page**

### **1) Publication Title**

Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation (SARS) and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – a systematic review of literature over four decades

### **2) Running Title**

Forty years of sacral anterior roots stimulation

### **3) Authors**

Thomas Guiho PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>; Christine Azevedo-Coste PhD<sup>1</sup>; Luc Bauchet MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Claire Delleci MD<sup>4</sup>; Jean-Rodolphe Vignes MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>; David Guiraud PhD<sup>1</sup>; Charles Fattal MD, PhD<sup>6</sup>.

### **4) Affiliations**

<sup>1</sup>INRIA, Centre Sophia Antipolis, CAMIN team, Montpellier, Occitanie, France

<sup>2</sup>Biosciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear, UK

<sup>3</sup>Department of neurosurgery, Gui de Chauliac Hospital, CHU Montpellier, Montpellier University Medical Center, Montpellier, Occitanie, France

<sup>4</sup>Department of physical medicine and rehabilitation, Pellegrin Hospital, CHU Bordeaux, Bordeaux University Medical Center, Bordeaux, Nouvelle Aquitaine, France

<sup>5</sup>Department of neurosurgery, Pellegrin Hospital, CHU Bordeaux, Bordeaux University  
Medical Center, Bordeaux, Nouvelle Aquitaine, France

<sup>6</sup>Centre Bouffard-Vercelli, Pôle Santé Roussillon, 66000 Perpignan, France

## **5) Corresponding author**

Thomas Guiho

### Email

[thomas.guiho@inria.fr](mailto:thomas.guiho@inria.fr) / [thomas.guiho@ncl.ac.uk](mailto:thomas.guiho@ncl.ac.uk)

### Adress

Thomas Guiho

INRIA – Campus Saint Priest, Bat. 5

860 Rue de St Priest

34095 Montpellier cedex 5 – France

## **6) Keywords**

Literature review, Neuroprosthesis, Spinal Cord Injury, Visceral fonctions, Sacral Anterior  
Root Stimulation.

**Accepted for publication in World Neurosurgery the 8<sup>th</sup> of September 2021**

1     **Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation (SARS) and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord**  
2                     **injury – a systematic review of literature over four decades**

3     Thomas Guiho PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>; Christine Azevedo-Coste PhD<sup>1</sup>; Luc Bauchet MD, PhD<sup>3</sup>; Claire Delleci MD<sup>4</sup>;  
4     Jean-Rodolphe Vignes MD, PhD<sup>5</sup>; David Guiraud PhD<sup>1</sup>; Charles Fattal MD, PhD<sup>6</sup>

5

6     **Abstract**

7

8     **Study design:** Systematic Review

9     **Objectives:** The sacral anterior root stimulator (SARS) was developed 40 years ago to restore  
10    urinary and bowel functions to individuals with spinal cord injury (SCI). Mostly used to  
11    restore lower urinary tract function, SARS implantation is coupled with sacral deafferentation  
12    to counteract the problems of chronic detrusor sphincter dyssynergia and detrusor  
13    overactivity. In this article, we systematically review 40 years of SARS implantation and  
14    assess the medical added-value of this approach in accordance with the PRISMA guidelines  
15    (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses). We identified four  
16    axes of investigation: i) impact on visceral functions, ii) implantation safety and device  
17    reliability, iii) individuals quality of life, and iv) additional information about the procedure.

18    **Methods:** Three databases were consulted: *Pubmed*, *EBSCOhost* and *Pascal*. 219 abstracts  
19    were screened and 38 publications were retained for analysis (1,147 implantations).

20    **Results:** The SARS technique showed good clinical results (85.9% of individuals used their  
21    implant for micturition and 67.9% to ease bowel movements) and improved individual quality

22 of life. Conversely, several sources of complications were reported after implantation  
23 (surgical complications, failures etc.).

24 **Conclusions:** Despite promising results, a decline in implantations was observed. This  
25 decline can be linked to the complication rate, as well as to the development of new  
26 therapeutics (botulinum toxin, etc.) and directions for research (spinal cord stimulation) that  
27 may have an impact on people. Nevertheless, the lack of alternatives in the short-term  
28 suggests that the SARS implant is still relevant for the restoration of visceral functions after  
29 SCI.

30

### 31 **Introduction**

32 Spinal cord injuries (SCI) have disastrous consequences for individuals, who, in addition to  
33 the motor impairments, must deal with sexual, bowel and urinary problems. Beyond their  
34 impact on health, these disorders have psychosocial implications that must not be neglected.  
35 Regarding lower urinary tract (LUT) function, SCI results in a communication breakdown  
36 between supraspinal and spinal levels that not only manifests by the loss of voluntary control  
37 of micturition but also by an exacerbation of reflex processes. Adult neurogenic lower urinary  
38 tract dysfunction (ANLUTD) refers to the urological symptoms associated with these  
39 disturbances and expresses clinically by two major problems: the disruption of the detrusor  
40 activity (detrusor overactivity – DO or detrusor underactivity – DU) and the detrusor  
41 sphincter dyssynergia (DSD).

42 In order to restore urinary function, a device based on a strategy of functional electrical  
43 stimulation (FES) – more specifically, sacral anterior root stimulation (SARS) – was  
44 developed 40 years ago (implantation of the first person in 1976 and entering into the market  
45 in 1982) (1): the Brindley-Finotech® implant (or SARS implant). Stimulation electrodes are

46 surgically disposed on S2 to S5 sacral anterior roots – i.e., roots composed of pelvic motor  
47 axons – and the device exploits the anatomical and physiological characteristics of the urinary  
48 tract to induce micturition. The detrusor being made up of slow dynamic smooth muscle  
49 fibers and the external urethral sphincter of fast dynamic striated muscle fibers; post-stimulus  
50 voiding is enabled by applying intermittent electrical stimulation. Indeed, at each stimulation  
51 cycle (3 seconds stimulation at 25 Hz followed by 6 seconds rest), the detrusor and the  
52 striated sphincter simultaneously contract and then relax asynchronously (striated sphincter  
53 relaxes instantly while detrusor contraction persists for a short time); this asynchrony is the  
54 source of a pressure gradient favorable to micturition. Default stimulation parameters – ie  
55 bladder-specific settings – might subsequently be adapted to either facilitate defecation  
56 (lengthening of stimulation cycles – 10 secs on then 20 secs off) or sustained erection in male  
57 individuals (decrease of stimulation frequency at either 8 or 12 Hz).

58 However, the Brindley device does not handle DO by itself as bladder contractions at low  
59 filling are still likely induced by the disturbed sacral reflex arch. Sacral deafferentation (i.e.,  
60 sectioning of the sacral posterior roots, procedure called rhizotomy) is often coupled with  
61 SARS implantation to prevent DO – and, consequently, promote bladder compliance – but  
62 results in the potentially irreversible loss of spared perineal sensation and function (erection  
63 and ejaculation in men, vaginal lubrication in women, defecation).

64 Recent technological improvements paved the way to optimized sacral stimulation paradigms  
65 likely to renew the interest for SARS-like approaches. In this context, reviewing the impact of  
66 Brindley implantation in patients with traumatic SCI seems an important step towards  
67 development of upgraded implants/strategies.

## 68 **Methods**

69 We reviewed 40 years of Brindley implant use – from 1976 to 2020 – by analyzing the data in  
70 terms of i) visceral function results, ii) occurrences of adverse effects, iii) quality of life  
71 impact/considerations, and iv) additional aspects, especially long-term concerns – e.g., impact  
72 of laminectomies on spinal stability or compatibility with MRI exams.

### 73 Literature search

74 This systematic review was performed according to the Preferred Reporting Items for  
75 Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) recommendations. Three databases were  
76 searched: *Pubmed (main database)*, *EBSCOhost (medical database)* and *Pascal (European*  
77 *and French database)* based on keywords selected by an engineer (TG) and a physician  
78 specialized in physical and rehabilitation medicine (CF). No language or date restrictions  
79 were applied and the last search was performed in August 2020. The search was carried out  
80 using the terms “sacral anterior root stimulator”, “implantable neurostimulator”, “neural  
81 prostheses”, “electrical stimulation therapy”, “neurogenic bladder”, “urinary incontinence”,  
82 “urinary retention, “bowel function”, “acceptability”, “failures”, “quality of life” and  
83 “psychology” confined to additional filters like “human species” and “adult” in *Pubmed*. The  
84 abstracts of all identified studies were screened by TG according to inclusion criteria defined  
85 with the senior authors. Only articles related to SARS in adults with SCI of traumatic origin  
86 were kept for analysis whatever their level of evidence (from cohort study to single subject  
87 design) or the number of implanted individuals (from large groups of persons to case study).  
88 TG then reviewed the selected articles in full text according to a review protocol designed in  
89 collaboration with CF, CA-C and DG. Manual inspection of the reference lists of all included  
90 papers was carried out to identify studies that were not captured by the online search (Figure  
91 1) and senior authors undertook a repeat review to ensure inclusion of all relevant articles.

### 92 Study selection

93 Evaluating the action of the SARS procedure implies assessing its impact in terms of  
94 improved visceral functions – LUT, defecation and erection – but also the risks inherent to  
95 implantation (surgery, technical failures, etc.). The impact of SARS on quality of life was also  
96 investigated in this literature review, as were several additional findings on long-term follow-  
97 up (compatibility with MRI exams, etc.).

98 Studies from the same research group were carefully inspected and only studies with  
99 significantly different numbers of individuals, sufficient temporal gaps and different  
100 population characteristics were kept for the first analysis. Two-part studies were treated  
101 separately when they reported results in two different axes of research.

#### 102 Raw data extraction and presentation

103 First, the main characteristics of each paper were extracted. The nature of the article  
104 (retrospective, prospective study, case study etc.), the year of publication and the main  
105 features of the investigated population (number of individuals, age, type of lesions, etc.) were  
106 examined. The level of evidence and the risk of bias were assessed at the same time using the  
107 recommendations of the Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine and the Cochrane's  
108 Risk of Bias in Non-randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool (2) respectively.

109 The article contents were analyzed through four reading grids, one for each axis, and the  
110 following information was extracted and combined in a table format:

- 111 • *Urological, intestinal, and sexual benefits*: use of the SARS implant for micturition,  
112 defecation and sexual purposes; bladder volume; volume of residual urine;  
113 incontinence episodes; urinary tract infections; autonomic dysreflexia before and after  
114 surgery.



- 115 • *Implantation procedure and reliability*: sacral deafferentation and implantation  
116 procedure; complications following surgery; implant failures; impact on peoples'  
117 everyday lives and long-term side effects; other considerations (benefits, etc.).
- 118 • *Individuals' quality of life*: population; survey modalities; results.
- 119 • *Studies providing additional information*.

## 120 Data analysis

121 Given the large amount of generated data and in order to avoid patient redundancy, articles  
122 authorships as well as medical centres location were extracted from each paper before  
123 grouping them by geographic areas – Austria, France, Germany, Netherlands, North America,  
124 South America, Spain, Switzerland and United Kingdom (Table 1, 2 and 3) – allowing for a  
125 better tracking of implanted individuals for advanced analysis. For the same medical centre,  
126 according to their level of evidence and bias, articles were primarily used for main analysis or  
127 only for data completion precluding multiple computation of data from a single individual. In  
128 the same way, only publication stating data from the same individuals before and after  
129 implantation were used for computation of urologic outcomes while data from multicentric  
130 studies – including the three articles authored by GS Brindley – were reported separately.  
131 Last, the mean values of the most salient variables in each of these table were calculated on  
132 the generated dataset in order to obtain a summary statement of the literature.

## 133 Statistical analysis

134 When available, standard deviations associated with pre- and post-implantation bladder and  
135 residual urine volumes were extracted for statistical analysis. After ensuring independence  
136 between study-level variances and sample sizes (plots of squared standard deviation versus  
137 sample size complemented with a monotony assessment using a spearman coefficient),

138 inverse variance weighting was used to implement both a fixed effect and a random effect  
139 meta-analytic model (Hunter and Schmidt model [HSM] (3)). Indicators of heterogeneity  $H^2$   
140 and  $I^2$  provided insights upon models' relevance and confirmed the validity of the HSM  
141 model. After obtaining the meta-analysis global estimates and standard errors, 95%  
142 confidence interval values were drawn from a t-distribution (t-score being more conservative  
143 than z-score). For qualitative indicators – presence/absence of UTI or incontinent episode,  
144 statistics were drawn from a t distribution after comparison of pre and post implantation  
145 ratios. 95% confidence intervals were then used to determine significance for  $\alpha=5\%$ . These  
146 statistical analyses were carried out using the Metalab toolbox developed in Matlab (4).

## 147 **Results**

### 148 **Research process and study design**

149 The flow diagram of the literature search is shown in Figure 1. At the end of the selection  
150 process, 38 articles were retained for analysis including 24 retrospective studies (5–28), 4  
151 prospective studies (29–32), 4 cross-sectional studies (33–36), 4 case reports (37–40), 1  
152 survey (41) and 1 basic research article (42).

153 Among these publications, 6 dealt with individuals quality of life (29,30,33–36), and 8 others  
154 – including two case reports – were placed in the category "Other considerations" (5,6,37–  
155 42). The axes "Benefits for visceral functions" and "Implantation procedure and reliability"  
156 regrouped the 24 remaining publications.

157 The raw data from these studies were compiled in a table format – five tables in total, one  
158 combining the population characteristics plus one for each axis of investigation  
159 (Supplementary Tab.1, Supplementary Tab.2, Supplementary Tab.3, Table 4 and Table 5).

160 Among these 38 publications, data from 4 multicentric studies (Supplementary Table 4) were

161 subsequently withdrawn from analysis (15–17,22) as they were grouping results from several  
162 medical centers and precluded individualized follow-up.

163 Two additional figures investigated the risk of bias (Supplementary Fig.1) and the level of  
164 evidence (Supplementary Fig.2) of these studies. Interestingly, a gradual shift was observed  
165 from visceral benefits and implant reliability to quality of life issues over the last decades  
166 while wider considerations such as the long-term outcome of implanted persons emerged  
167 rather recently (Supplementary Fig.2).

#### 168 Data analysis

169 A total of 1,147 implanted persons were tracked in 34 articles including 712 men and 435  
170 women (Table 1). Individuals' mean age at the time of implantation was 36 years (ranged  
171 between 26.3 and 40 years, n=1,091) while 467 (31.3%) persons had tetraplegia and 680  
172 (68.7%) paraplegia. The mean time between spinal injury and implantation was 8.45 years  
173 (varied from 1.86 to 11.17 years, n=1,097) and the mean post-implantation follow-up was  
174 12.3 years (between 4.4 and 14.6 years, n=957). Implantations were performed on people with  
175 complete SCI in 88.9% [77-100%] of cases (mean [range of the means by geographical  
176 areas], n=1124).

#### 177 Benefits for visceral functions

178 The impact of the Brindley implant on urinary, intestinal and sexual functions was initially  
179 reported in 24 studies. Of these 24 studies, 50% were ranked as level II or III, while the  
180 remaining 50% were categorized as level IV or V (Table 2).

181 Among the 1,147 individuals identified with SARS implant, 880 individuals were asked for  
182 their current situation and 85.9% [73-100%] stated using their implant for micturition. Their  
183 averaged bladder capacity significantly increased from 198 mL [173-264 mL] before

184 implantation to 480 mL [401-546 mL] (n=751) after implantation (HSM for 295 individuals  
185 (10,17,19,30,32): mean increase in bladder volume = 279 mL; 95% Confidence Interval [CI],  
186 +191 to +354 mL), whereas the mean volume of residual urine after micturition decreased  
187 significantly from 131 mL [90-157 mL] (n=57) to 46 mL [16-85.7 mL] (HSM for 72 people  
188 (11,12,17,30): mean decrease in residual urine = - 97 mL; 95% CI, -71 to -122 mL). Urinary  
189 incontinence affected 86% [61-100%] and 35.5% [7-65%] of the individuals before and after  
190 implantation respectively (n=691; t-distribution, p<0.05). Urinary tract infections decreased  
191 from 6.3 to 1.3 episodes per year in the German group (n=464) while the overall percentage  
192 of persons affected by urinary tract infections in other areas dropped from 93% [87.7-100%]  
193 to 39% [15-78%] (n=402, t-distribution, p<0.05).

194 In addition to the LUT data, 67.9% [29-100%] of the patients (n=654) used their implant to  
195 facilitate bowel movements, while 62.1% [30-100%] of the male individuals (n=143 of 230  
196 males) were able to obtain stimulation-induced erections. Finally, the proportion of  
197 individuals with autonomic dysreflexia decreased from 43.3% [16-66%] to 3% [0-9%] after  
198 implantation (n=895).

### 199 Implantation procedure and reliability

200 SARS implant reliability and impact on individuals with SCI was assessed by five modalities:  
201 i) nature of the surgical procedure, ii) surgical complications, iii) implant failures, iv) long-  
202 term complications, and v) additional information (benefits of the implantation, problems  
203 using the implant, etc.). The corresponding data were drawn from 22 publications gathering  
204 989 implanted individuals from 10 level II or III studies – 45.5% – and 12 level IV or V  
205 publications – 54.5% (Table 3).

206 In 83.3% of individuals, Brindley devices were implanted intradurally. Sacral deafferentation  
207 was attempted in 99.4% of cases with a success rate of 93.9%. A total of 34 immediate post-

208 surgical complications occurred after the initial surgery (3.4% - infections, cerebrospinal fluid  
209 leakage, etc.). Adverse effects caused by the implant/stimulation were reported in 54 cases  
210 (5.5%: muscle spasms, stimulus pain, infections, etc.), whereas 209 implant faults (21.1% of  
211 implants) were reported leading to 136 revision surgeries (surgeries to replace implant  
212 failures: 13.7%). Last, the SARS procedure proved to be insufficient in 63 persons (6.3%)  
213 who faced persistent urinary disorders (incontinence, sphincterotomy, etc.).

214 Nevertheless, the cleanest database on the subject remains Brindley's 1995 publication  
215 overviewing the 500 first implanted individuals (8) (Supplementary Tab.4).

#### 216 Patient quality of life

217 Six publications were classed in this axis (Table 4; 488 individuals: 138 from level II and 350  
218 from level III studies). In a nutshell, two distinct groups emerged and the conclusions drawn  
219 by Wielink et al. (29), Vastenholt et al. (33) and Rasmussen et al. (35) differed slightly from  
220 those of Creasey et al. (30), Martens et al. (34) and Zaer et al. (36).

221 For Wielink et al. (29) and Vastenholt et al. (33), implantation had an overall beneficial  
222 impact on individuals but this improvement was either not statistically significant (Wielink et  
223 al. (29)) or concerned only half the persons (people expectations met in 49% of cases in  
224 Vastenholt et al. (33)). Rasmussen et al. (35), for their part, only assessed quality of life  
225 related to bowel function in implanted individuals with no real improvement.

226 Conversely, no reservation was expressed about the positive impact of implantation in  
227 Creasey et al. (30)(improvement in 86.8% of the cases), Martens et al. (34) (results from  
228 Qualiveen and SF-36 questionnaire) and Zaer et al. (36) (overall satisfaction of implanted  
229 individuals and improvements of bladder function), for which a clear improvement in  
230 individual's quality of life was demonstrated.

231 Additional information

232 Eight publications were retained to complement this review as they were dealing with aspects  
233 little or not documented in previous studies (Table 5; 204 individuals from level IV or V  
234 studies including 4 case studies). Among these papers, six dealt directly with the  
235 consequences of implantation (5,6,37–40), while the last two (41,42) were focused on the  
236 prospects of this design of implant.

237 Lopez de Heredia et al. (5) concluded on the safety of MRI examination in implanted persons  
238 when conducting examinations in a 1.5 Tesla system – a central concern for the follow-up of  
239 people with SCI. Krebs et al. (6) showed no significant alteration of bladder contraction  
240 during stimulation-induced micturition in 111 patients 11.7 years after implantation.

241 Conversely, Soni et al. (37) questioned the long-term impact of laminectomy on spinal  
242 balance by reporting fractures of L4 and L5 vertebral bodies in one patient that induced a  
243 deterioration in his condition eventually leading to the cessation of implant use. Vaidyanathan  
244 et al. (38) and Bramall et al. (40) reported implant infections with complete removal of the  
245 device while Pannek et al. (39) reported the case of a patient with life-threatening autonomic  
246 dysreflexia for whom sacral deafferentation was necessary but who refused SARS  
247 implantation – raising genuine questions about the psychological impact of neuroprosthetic  
248 implantation.

249 Dealing with the future of the SARS implant, Kirkham et al. (42) investigated simultaneous  
250 stimulation of both anterior and posterior roots to restore LUT function without sacral  
251 deafferentation but concluded to the failure of the investigated procedure while Sanders et al.  
252 (41) attempted to identify patients' preferences for future neuroprostheses and highlighted the  
253 major role of the benefit-risk ratio on implant acceptability.

254 Discussion

255 Level of evidence

256 This systematic review gathered 1,147 implanted individuals from 34 publications. These 34  
257 articles presented unequal levels of evidence (studies with a control group/level II: 2;  
258 prospective studies/level III: 11; retrospective studies/level IV: 11; case studies and short  
259 communications/level V: 10) as well as unequal risk of bias (supplementary Fig.1).

260 The number of publications classed under each axis of research proved also highly variable  
261 (Supplementary Fig.2). Most of the collected data related either to clinical results on visceral  
262 functions (n=24) or implant reliability (n=22). Only a few dealt with quality of life (n=6),  
263 although these studies had the highest level of evidence (level II or III) while long-term  
264 considerations were often limited to low-evidence articles (8 articles: levels IV or V including  
265 4 case studies).

266 Assessment of Brindley implantation

## 267 a) Benefit/risk balance

268 For all clinical examinations – bladder capacity, volume of residual urine, incontinence  
269 episodes, urinary infections, facilitation of bowel movements, autonomic dysreflexia – a gain  
270 of function was systematically observed as a results of a combined SARS and sacral  
271 deafferentation procedure in all the investigated studies (Table 2).

272 Apart from the imponderables of such a procedure – i.e., surgery, electronic device  
273 implantation and sacral deafferentation – discomfort resulted mostly from surgical  
274 complications or implant failures that were corrected spontaneously (leak of cerebrospinal  
275 fluid, neuropraxia etc.) or after a second surgery (cable replacement, second extradural  
276 implantation) (Table 3). Deafferentation was responsible for constipation or erectile  
277 dysfunction but had a rather unpredictable impact on fecal incontinence; promoting stress

278 incontinence of feces – by reducing reflex contraction of the anal sphincter – in one hand or  
279 decreasing fecal incontinence by reducing bowel reflex contractions in the other hand.

280 The aging of the implanted population raised previously unknown issues, such as the impact  
281 of laminectomy on spine balance or the safety of MRI exams (implant successfully tested  
282 with 1.5 Tesla MR System (5) while manufacturer documentation reports safe procedures  
283 with > 0.5 Tesla machines). Brindley also reported two death in his follow-up of the first 500  
284 implanted individuals (7,8) – one due to renal failure and the other from primary bladder  
285 carcinomatosis (Supplementary Tab.3) – but none was mentioned in the 34 retained studies.

286 As patients' expectations for the implant are often very high – and legitimately so – these  
287 unexpected drawbacks might have engendered frustration despite the overall success of the  
288 procedure. This might explain the results – globally positive but somewhat contrasted – of  
289 quality of life studies (Table 4).

#### 290 b) Decline in the use of the implant

291 In addition to the SARS implant, other competing solutions – surgical and drug approaches –  
292 emerged in recent years offering patients and medical staff several therapeutic alternatives  
293 especially to treat refractory DO (43). Surgical solutions include augmentation  
294 enterocystoplasty and/or continent cystostomy and offer the advantage of achieving both  
295 sustainable results and an optimal action on DO but constitute unique invasive procedures.  
296 Medication approaches may also be prescribed such as semi-invasive botulinum toxin  
297 injections. However, repeated injections are needed to achieve a significant decrease in DO  
298 emphasizing the transient impact of this procedure and the discontinuous nature of the  
299 generated effect – discontinuity that generates discomfort in patients waiting for renewal of  
300 the injection. Finally, both botulinum toxin and surgical approaches do not enable patients to  
301 get away from intermittent (self-) catheterization to manage DSD issues.



302 From an economic perspective, additional reports concluded the cumulative cost of treatment  
303 with the neuroprosthesis – including the cost of the device, its implantation and maintenance –  
304 to be equaled of those of conventional care on a time horizon between 5- and 8-years post-  
305 implantation (comparison before and after implantation (29,44)). Subsequent studies further  
306 investigated the cost-effectiveness ratio of the SARS approach to deeply inform decision  
307 makers of the opportunity to reimburse this procedure (versus a control group (45,46)) and  
308 provided recommendations in favor of the Finetech-Brindley implant. Nevertheless, these  
309 conclusions were a bit contrasted by the mixed results reported in studies focused on the  
310 quality of life of the implanted population (29,30,33–36). Thus, in the vast majority of cases,  
311 the cost of the procedure is still largely borne by patients while some alternatives are cheaper  
312 on a shorter term and more easily reimbursed by the health care system. This lead to a  
313 potentially insurmountable financial burden on interested individuals that will dissuade them  
314 from opting for the neuroprosthesis and may further explain, at least in part, the decline in  
315 implantation. Likewise, the gradual decline in implantation leads to a reduction in trained  
316 surgical services and to an even greater reduction in the number of prescriptions making this  
317 approach slowly falling back into anonymity.

318 Beyond the aforementioned factors, the rise of the Internet facilitates public access to recent  
319 scientific advances and raises expectation for the development of a medium-term  
320 comprehensive solution (stem-cell therapy, neuroprosthesis etc.). Patients are therefore more  
321 likely to preserve their "neurological capital" – and so to reject any deafferentation – and to  
322 suspend all surgical procedures while waiting for this new solution.

323 Distrust of some patients with regard to the implantation of electronic devices for ideological  
324 considerations may also constitute a limiting factor.

325 c) Targeted population

326 SARS is therefore one of the solutions to overcome visceral deficiency but by both its nature  
327 and the incidence of adverse effects, the generalization of its recourse is unlikely; secondary  
328 ejaculatory dysfunction and loss of sensitivity already precluding deafferentation in persons  
329 with incomplete lesions. However, since the population of patients with a spinal cord injury is  
330 very disparate – particularly with respect to the lesion profiles or the age of the individuals –  
331 SARS implant may still be relevant for certain categories of patients:

- 332 • Aging patient with paraplegia or tetraplegia (woman or man) in trouble to continue  
333 self-catheterization.
- 334 • Women with paraplegia or tetraplegia, able to perform self-catheterization, to transfer  
335 and to undress but confronted with residual incontinence (DO – different form stress  
336 incontinence) that cannot be collected by a specific device equivalent to the penile sheath in  
337 men.
- 338 • Women or men with paraplegia or tetraplegia who can no longer or cannot apply  
339 intermittent self-catheterization due to overweight or obesity.
- 340 • Patient with paraplegia or tetraplegia (woman or man) who refuses self-catheterization  
341 for practical reasons or to avoid urinary tract infections.

342 Although ANULTD management is very much dependent on the patient's medical condition  
343 and willingness, several studies have helped to deeply revise the current therapeutic arsenal to  
344 provide easy-to-follow treatment guidelines applicable to large cohorts of patients. Based on  
345 the objective to be achieved: i) continence with intermittent catheterization, ii) continence  
346 without catheterization, or iii) reflex micturition, several therapeutic stratagems might be  
347 implemented to help patients with DO or DSD – see Denys et al (47), Wyndaele et al (48) or  
348 Anquetil et al (43) for more details. Nevertheless, it might be worth complementing these

349 guidelines by mentioning that Brindley implantation is not precluding future urological  
350 surgeries when, conversely, prior urological intervention is likely to prevent SARS procedure.

### 351 Study limitations

352 The lack of randomized or multi-group studies reduced the level of certainty of this  
353 systematic review. This situation can be explained by the difficulty of setting up randomized  
354 protocols because of both the invasiveness of surgery and people high expectations about  
355 implantation. It might also be due to the relative paucity of complete spinal cord injury as  
356 examiners might have anticipated that such a randomization would had decrease their  
357 recruitment potential. Similarly, setting up cross-over studies seems very unlikely because of  
358 the sacral deafferentation. Most of the publications on SARS have come from neurosurgical  
359 departments and, unsurprisingly, many of these studies dealt exclusively with urological and  
360 surgical outcomes, while few focused on patient quality of life.

361 As the selected studies were performed at different location across the globe, differing  
362 surgeries, post-surgical treatment care and rehabilitation may have affected outcomes. Only  
363 few studies reporting fragmentary data were thus available for individuals implanted in Spain  
364 or United Kingdom. Absence of a systematic report of pre and post-surgery data – as well as  
365 their respective variances – further undermine the impact of our conclusions by drastically  
366 reducing the number of implanted people eligible for final analysis. Discrepancies in follow-  
367 up periods and reporting procedures, especially regarding postoperative complication/care and  
368 quality of life assessment, also make synthetizing these data extremely difficult – our study is,  
369 to the best of our knowledge, the first systematic review on the SARS implant. In the same  
370 way, as this literature review extending over four decades, both the surgical approach and the  
371 implant reliability were continuously refined for the succeeding studies. Originally implanted  
372 without deafferentation, outcomes of the first/pioneer studies were likely impacted by the

373 preservation of a disturbed sacral reflex arch in some individuals while management of side  
374 effects has progressively improved over time. Ultimately, as patient long term follow-up is  
375 often ensured by clinical centers close to the patients' homes, long-term assessment of large  
376 cohorts of individuals remains a challenge. It is therefore not surprising that most of the  
377 publications related to long-term implantation consequences are case studies.

378

### 379 Future directions

380 The main limitation of the implantation procedure remains the systematic posterior root  
381 rhizotomy. New stimulation strategies are currently studied to bypass this procedure and are  
382 mainly based on direct spinal cord stimulation (49,50) or on a combination of spinal roots and  
383 pudendal nerve stimulation. These main approaches are the so called "LION approach" (51),  
384 the sphincter fatigue procedure (52), the blocking technique (53,54) and the high frequency  
385 technique (55).

386

### 387 Conclusions

388 Despite generally positive results on visceral functions – especially LUT function – the  
389 number of Brindley implantation procedures has declined in recent years. Although the risks  
390 inherent to this procedure was minimized, the emergence of mini-invasive therapeutic  
391 alternatives such as botulinum toxin therapy has limited its use. The deafferentation coupled  
392 with the implantation procedure dissuades many persons frightened by its very invasive  
393 nature. However, sacral deafferentation might still constitute a valid alternative in individuals  
394 with a botulinum toxin-resistant bladder and might still be considered in competition with  
395 more widespread urological surgeries such as enterocystoplasty.

396 The rehabilitation of visceral functions remains a major concern of individuals with SCI, and  
397 thus many research teams are dedicated to finding less invasive solutions or alternatives that  
398 are likely to offer these persons a dramatic gain in quality of life. Nonetheless, the lack of  
399 alternatives in the short term suggests that the SARS and SARS-like implants are still relevant  
400 within the therapeutic arsenal.

401

#### 402 **Data Archiving**

403 All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

404

#### 405 **Acknowledgments**

406 The authors would like to thank Christine Gilbert for her help in the literature search.

407

#### 408 **Conflict of Interest Statement**

409 The authors report no conflict of interest concerning the materials or methods used in this  
410 study or the findings specified in this paper.

411

#### 412 **Author Contributions**

413 TG was responsible for designing the review protocol, conducting the search, screening  
414 potentially eligible studies, extracting and analyzing data, interpreting results, creating tables,  
415 and writing the report.

416 CF was responsible for designing the review protocol, conducting the search and assessing  
417 potentially eligible studies. He contributed to writing the report and interpreting results.

418 CAC and DG contributed to the review protocol and provided feedback on the report.

419 CD, LB, JRV interpreting results and provided feedback on the report.

420

421 **Funding**

422 This work was carried out with the support of the I-SITE MUSE, Companies on Campus  
423 program (SPINSTIM project – AAP18ENT-FRM06-SPINSTIM) and an ERANET Neuron  
424 joint call co-funded by the Medical Research Council (R001189). The Companies on Campus  
425 program financed the SPINSTIM project and the ERANET call financed Thomas Guiho.

426

427 **References**

- 428 1. Brindley GS. History of the sacral anterior root stimulator, 1969–1982. *Neurourol*  
429 *Urodyn.* 1993;
- 430 2. McGuinness LA, Higgins JPT. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and  
431 Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. In: *Research Synthesis*  
432 *Methods.* 2021;
- 433 3. Hunter J, Schmidt F. *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research*  
434 *findings.* <https://books.google.fr/books>. 2004;
- 435 4. Mikolajewicz N, Komarova S V. *Meta-Analytic Methodology for Basic Research: A*  
436 *Practical Guide.* *Front Physiol.* 2019;
- 437 5. Lopez De Heredia L, Meagher TMM, Jamous MA, Hughes RJ. Long-term effect of  
438 MRI on sacral anterior root stimulator: The Stoke Mandeville experience. *Spinal Cord.*  
439 2012;
- 440 6. Krebs J, Wöllner J, Grasmücke D, Pannek J. Long-term course of sacral anterior root  
441 stimulation in spinal cord injured individuals: The fate of the detrusor. *Neurourol*  
442 *Urodyn.* 2017;

- 443 7. Brindley GS. The first 500 patients with sacral anterior root stimulator implants:  
444 General description. *Paraplegia*. 1994;
- 445 8. Brindley GS. The first 500 sacral anterior root stimulators: Implant failures and their  
446 repair. *Paraplegia*. 1995;
- 447 9. Van Kerrebroeck PEV, Koldewijn EL, Rosier PFWM, Wijkstra H, Debruyne FMJ.  
448 Results of the treatment of neurogenic bladder dysfunction in spinal cord injury by  
449 sacral posterior root rhizotomy and anterior sacral root stimulation. *J Urol*. 1996;
- 450 10. Egon G, Barat M, Colombel P, Visentin C, Isambert JL, Guerin J. Implantation of  
451 anterior sacral root stimulators combined with posterior sacral rhizotomy in spinal  
452 injury patients. *World J Urol*. 1998;
- 453 11. Schurch B, Knapp PA, Jeanmonudj D, Rodic B, Rossler AB. Does sacral posterior  
454 rhizotomy suppress autonomie hyper-reflexia in patients with spinal cord injury? *Br J*  
455 *Urol*. 1998;
- 456 12. Van Der Aa HE, Alleman E, Nene A, Snoek G. Sacral anterior root stimulation for  
457 bladder control: Clinical results. *Arch Physiol Biochem*. 1999;
- 458 13. Bauchet L, Segnarbieux F, Martinazzo G, Frerebeau P, Ohanna F. Traitement  
459 neurochirurgical de la vessie hyperactive chez le blessé médullaire. 2001;13–24.
- 460 14. Sauerwein DS. Sacral deafferentation with implantation of an anterior root stimulator.  
461 Experience after 15 years in 430 patients. *Eur Urol Suppl*. 2003;
- 462 15. Hamel O, Perrouin-Verbe B, Robert R. Brindley technique with intradural  
463 deafferentation and extradural implantation by a single sacral laminectomy.  
464 *Neurochirurgie*. 2004;

- 465 16. Kutzenberger J, Domurath B, Sauerwein D. Spastic bladder and spinal cord injury:  
466 Seventeen years of experience with sacral deafferentation and implantation of an  
467 anterior root stimulator. *Artif Organs*. 2005;
- 468 17. Madersbacher H, Fischer J, Ebner A. Anterior sacral root stimulator (Brindley):  
469 Experiences especially in women with neurogenic urinary incontinence. *Neurourol*  
470 *Urodyn*. 1988;
- 471 18. Kutzenberger J. Surgical therapy of neurogenic detrusor overactivity (hyperreflexia) in  
472 paraplegic patients by sacral deafferentation and implant driven micturition by sacral  
473 anterior root stimulation: Methods, indications, results, complications, and future  
474 prospects. *Acta Neurochirurgica, Supplementum*. 2007.
- 475 19. Krasmik D, Krebs J, Van Ophoven A, Pannek J. Urodynamic results, clinical efficacy,  
476 and complication rates of sacral intradural deafferentation and sacral anterior root  
477 stimulation in patients with neurogenic lower urinary tract dysfunction resulting from  
478 complete spinal cord injury. *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2014;
- 479 20. Castaño-Botero JC, Ospina-Galeano IA, Gómez-Illanes R, Lopera-Toro A. Extradural  
480 implantation of sacral anterior root stimulator in spinal cord injury patients. *Neurourol*  
481 *Urodyn*. 2016;
- 482 21. Ramos LV, Illanes\* RG, Pantoja RC. MP48-09 EXPERIENCE WITH SARS  
483 (SACRAL ANTERIOR ROOT STIMULATOR) IN SUPRASACRAL SPINAL CORD  
484 INJURY PATIENTS. *J Urol*. 2020;
- 485 22. ROBINSON LQ, GRANT A, WESTON P, STEPHENSON TP, LUCAS M, THOMAS  
486 DG. Experience with the Brindley Anterior Sacral Root Stimulator. *Br J Urol*. 1988;
- 487 23. Brindley GS, Rushton DN. Long-term follow-up of patients with sacral anterior root



- 488 stimulator implants. Paraplegia. 1990;
- 489 24. Sauerwein D, Ingunza W, Fischer J, Madersbacher H, Polkey CE, Brindley GS, et al.  
490 Extradural implantation of sacral anterior root stimulators. J Neurol Neurosurg  
491 Psychiatry. 1990;
- 492 25. Barat M, Egon G, Daverat P, Colombel P, Guerin J. Why does continence fail after  
493 sacral anterior root stimulator? Neurourol Urodyn. 1993;
- 494 26. Egon G, Colombel P, Isambert JL, Guerin J, Barat M. Evolution of bladder contraction  
495 in course of time after implantation of a sacral anterior root stimulator. Neurourol  
496 Urodyn. 1993;
- 497 27. Madersbacher H, Fischer J. Sacral anterior root stimulation: Prerequisites and  
498 indications. Neurourol Urodyn. 1993;
- 499 28. Sarrias M, Sarrias F, Borau A. The “Barcelona” technique. Neurourol Urodyn. 1993;
- 500 29. Wielink G, Essink-Bot ML, Van Kerrebroeck PEV, Rutten FFH, Bosch JLHR,  
501 Debruyne FMJ, et al. Sacral rhizotomies and electrical bladder stimulation in spinal  
502 cord injury. 2. Cost-effectiveness and quality of life analysis. Eur Urol. 1997;
- 503 30. Creasey GH, Grill JH, Korsten M, U HS, Betz R, Anderson R, et al. An implantable  
504 neuroprosthesis for restoring bladder and bowel control to patients with spinal cord  
505 injuries: A multicenter trial. Arch Phys Med Rehabil. 2001;
- 506 31. MacDonagh RP, Sun WM, Smallwood R, Forster D, Read NW. Control of defecation  
507 in patients with spinal injuries by stimulation of sacral anterior nerve roots. Br Med J.  
508 1990;
- 509 32. Van Kerrebroeck E V, van der Aa HE, Bosch JL, Koldewijn EL, Vorsteveld JH,

- 510 Debruyne FM. Sacral rhizotomies and electrical bladder stimulation in spinal cord  
511 injury. Part I: Clinical and urodynamic analysis. Dutch Study Group on Sacral Anterior  
512 Root Stimulation. *Eur Urol.* 1997;
- 513 33. Vastenholt JM, Snoek GJ, Buschman HPJ, Van Der Aa HE, Alleman ERJ, Ijzerman  
514 MJ. A 7-year follow-up of sacral anterior root stimulation for bladder control in  
515 patients with a spinal cord injury: Quality of life and users' experiences. *Spinal Cord.*  
516 2003;
- 517 34. Martens FMJ, den Hollander PP, Snoek GJ, Koldewijn EL, van Kerrebroeck PEV a,  
518 Heesakkers JPF a. Quality of life in complete spinal cord injury patients with a  
519 Brindley bladder stimulator compared to a matched control group. *Neurourol Urodyn.*  
520 2011;30(4):551–5.
- 521 35. Rasmussen MM, Kutzenberger J, Krogh K, Zepke F, Bodin C, Domurath B, et al.  
522 Sacral anterior root stimulation improves bowel function in subjects with spinal cord  
523 injury. *Spinal Cord.* 2015;
- 524 36. Zaer H, Rasmussen MM, Zepke F, Bodin C, Domurath B, Kutzenberger J. Effect of  
525 spinal anterior root stimulation and sacral deafferentation on bladder and sexual  
526 dysfunction in spinal cord injury. *Acta Neurochir (Wien).* 2018;
- 527 37. Soni BM, Oo T, Vaidyanathan S, Hughes PL, Singh G. Complications of sacral  
528 anterior root stimulator implantation in a cervical spinal cord injury patient: Increased  
529 spasms requiring intrathecal baclofen therapy followed by delayed fracture of lumbar  
530 spine leading to intractable spasms compelling disuse of. *Spinal Cord.* 2004.
- 531 38. Vaidyanathan S, Soni BM, Oo T, Hughes PL, Mansour P, Singh G. Infection of  
532 Brindley sacral anterior root stimulator by *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* requiring removal

- 533 of the implant: Long-term deleterious effects on bowel and urinary bladder function in  
534 a spinal cord injury patient with tetraplegia: A case report. *Cases J.* 2009;
- 535 39. Pannek J, Göcking K, Bersch U. Sacral rhizotomy: A salvage procedure in a patient  
536 with autonomic dysreflexia. *Spinal Cord.* 2010;
- 537 40. Bramall A, Chaudhary B, Ahmad J, Shamji MF. Chronic infection of a Brindley sacral  
538 nerve root stimulator. *BMJ Case Rep.* 2016;
- 539 41. Sanders PMH, Ijzerman MJ, Roach MJ, Gustafson KJ. Patient preferences for next  
540 generation neural prostheses to restore bladder function. *Spinal Cord.* 2011;
- 541 42. Kirkham APS, Knight SL, Craggs MD, Casey ATM, Shah PJR. Neuromodulation  
542 through sacral nerve roots 2 to 4 with a Finetech-Brindley sacral posterior and anterior  
543 root stimulator. *Spinal Cord.* 2002;
- 544 43. Anquetil C, Abdelhamid S, Gelis A, Fattal C. Botulinum toxin therapy for neurogenic  
545 detrusor hyperactivity versus augmentation enterocystoplasty: Impact on the quality of  
546 life of patients with SCI. *Spinal Cord.* 2016;
- 547 44. Creasey GH, Dahlberg JE. Economic consequences of an implanted neuroprosthesis  
548 for bladder and bowel management. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2001;
- 549 45. Morlière C, Verpillot E, Donon L, Salmi LR, Joseph PA, Vignes JR, et al. A cost-  
550 utility analysis of sacral anterior root stimulation (SARS) compared with medical  
551 treatment in patients with complete spinal cord injury with a neurogenic bladder. *Spine*  
552 *J.* 2015;
- 553 46. Bénard A, Verpillot E, Grandoulier AS, Perrouin-Verbe B, Chêne G, Vignes JR.  
554 Comparative cost-effectiveness analysis of sacral anterior root stimulation for

- 555 rehabilitation of bladder dysfunction in spinal cord injured patients. *Neurosurgery*.  
556 2013;
- 557 47. Denys P, Corcos J, Everaert K, Chartier-Kastler E, Fowler C, Kalsi V, et al. Improving  
558 the global management of the neurogenic bladder patient: Part II. Future treatment  
559 strategies. *Current Medical Research and Opinion*. 2006.
- 560 48. Wyndaele JJ, Birch B, Borau A, Burks F, Castro-Diaz D, Chartier-Kastler E, et al.  
561 Surgical management of the neurogenic bladder after spinal cord injury. *World Journal*  
562 *of Urology*. 2018.
- 563 49. Guiho T, Delleci C, Azevedo-Coste C, Fattal C, Guiraud D, Vignes JR, et al. Impact of  
564 direct epispinal stimulation on bladder and bowel functions in pigs: A feasibility study.  
565 *Neurourol Urodyn*. 2018;
- 566 50. Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Andreu D, Delleci C, Bauchet L, Vignes JR, et al.  
567 Functional selectivity of lumbosacral stimulation: Methodological approach and pilot  
568 study to assess visceral function in pigs. *IEEE Trans Neural Syst Rehabil Eng*. 2018;
- 569 51. Possover M, Schurch B, Henle K-P. New strategies of pelvic nerves stimulation for  
570 recovery of pelvic visceral functions and locomotion in paraplegics. *Neurourol Urodyn*.  
571 2010;29(8):1433–8.
- 572 52. Li JS, Hassouna M, Sawan M, Duval F, Elhilali MM. Long-Term Effect of Sphincteric  
573 Fatigue During Bladder Neurostimulation. *J Urol*. 1995;
- 574 53. Rijkhoff NJM, Wijkstra H, Van Kerrebroeck PEV, Debruyne FMJ. Selective detrusor  
575 activation by sacral ventral nerve-root stimulation: Results of intraoperative testing in  
576 humans during implantation of a Finetech-Brindley system. *World J Urol*. 1998;

- 577 54. Peh WYX, Mogan R, Thow XY, Chua SM, Rusly A, Thakor N V., et al. Novel  
578 neurostimulation of autonomic pelvic nerves overcomes Bladder-sphincter  
579 dyssynergia. Front Neurosci. 2018;
- 580 55. Boger A, Bhadra N, Gustafson KJ. Bladder voiding by combined high frequency  
581 electrical pudendal nerve block and sacral root stimulation. Neurourol Urodyn. 2008;

582

### 583 **Figure Legends**

584

585 Figure 1. Flow diagram of the literature search

586 Table 1. Study and patient characteristics per geographic areas

587 Table 2. Benefits for visceral functions (geographic areas)

588 Table 3. Implantation procedure and reliability axis

589 Table 4. Patient quality of life

590 Table 5. Additional information

591

### 592 **Supplementary Figure Legends**

593 Supplementary Fig.1. Cochrane's Risk of Bias in Non-randomized Studies of Interventions

594 (ROBINS-I) plot

595 Supplementary Fig.2 – Articles characteristics. a) Distribution of the selected publications  
596 classified according to their topics and their year of publication, b) Strength of evidence of the  
597 selected articles

598 Supplementary Tab.1. Study and patient characteristics (all studies)

599 Supplementary Tab.2. Benefits for visceral functions (all studies)

600 Supplementary Tab.3. Implantation procedure and reliability axis (all studies)

601 Supplementary Tab.4. Multicentric studies




Table 1 – Study and patients characteristics per geographic areas

Location and period of publication [First to Last papers]	Identified groups	References* and level of evidence	% of male patient	Mean age at the time of implantation (in years)	Lesion profile T – Tetraplegia P – Paraplegia	% of complete SCI	Mean age of the lesion at the time of implantation (in years)	Mean patient follow up after implantation (in years)
Austria [1988-1993]	Innsbruck	[Made88] – IV [Made93] – V	27 -> n=30	26.3 -> n=7	Trauma: 30 T – 10 / P – 20 -> n=30	97 -> n=30	1.86 -> n=7	<8 -> n=30
United Kingdom [1988-2012]	Cardiff Sheffield Southport	[Robi88] – IV [MacD90] – III [Kirk02] – IV [Soni04] – V [Vaid09] – V [DeHe12] – IV	91.75 -> n=24	34.5 -> n=2	Trauma: 24 T – 9 / P – 15 -> n=24	91.75 -> n=24	4.96 -> n=24	10.5 -> n=2
France [1993-2004]	Bordeaux Le Mans Montpellier Nantes	[Bara93] – V [Egon93] – V [Egon98] – IV [Bauc01] – III [Hame04] – IV	65.1 -> n=120	33.6 -> n=116	Trauma: 116 Unspecified: 4 T – 48 / P – 72 -> n=120	85.8 -> n=120	6.6 -> n=116	5.34 -> n=116
Spain [1993]	Barcelona	[Sarr93] – V	14.3 -> n=7	-	Trauma: 7 T – 3 / P – 4 -> n=7	-	-	-
Netherlands [1996-2011]	Enschede Nijmegen Rotterdam	[Vank96] – IV [Vank97] – III [Wiel97] – III [VanD99] – III [Vast03] – II [Mart11] – II	68.6 -> n=89	37.1 -> n=89	Trauma: 89 T – 25 / P – 64 -> n=89	100 -> n=89	6.67 -> n=89	4.8 -> n=89
Switzerland [1998-2017]	Nottwil Zurich	[Schu98] – III [Pann10] – V [Kras14] – III [Kreb17] – IV	57.1 -> n=147	39.2 -> n=147	Trauma: 147 T – 58 / P – 89 -> n=147	95.9 -> n=147	11.17 -> n=147	14.05 -> n=147
North America [2001-2016]	Cleveland New York Philadelphia San Diego Stanford Toronto	[Crea01] – III [Sand11] – IV [Bram16] – V	70 -> n=23	40 -> n=23	Trauma: 23 T – 6 / P – 17 -> n=23	100 -> n=23	7 -> n=23	> 1 year but some results are missing -> n=23
Germany [2003-2018]	Bad Wildungen	[Saue03] – V [Kutz05] – IV [Kutz07] – IV [Rasm15] – III [Zaer18] – III	57 -> n=587	34.9 -> n=587	Trauma: 561 Other specified causes: 26 T – 266 / P – 321 -> n=587	84.5 -> n=587	8.9 -> n=587	14.6 -> n=587
South America [2016-2020]	Medellin Santiago de Chile	[Cast16] – III [Ramo] – V	89.2 -> n=120	38.7 -> n=120	Trauma: 103 Unspecified: 17 T – 42 / P – 78 -> n=120	92.3 -> n=104	7.25 -> n=104	4.4 -> n=16

\*References presented as the four first letters of the first author surname followed by the two last digits of the year of publication; -> n = total number of implanted individuals with available information for each area



Table 2 – Benefits on visceral functions (geographic areas)

Location	Use of SARS for micturition (%)	Mean bladder capacity (volume in ml)		Mean residual urine (volume in ml)		Incontinent episodes (%)		Urinary tract infections		Autonomic dysreflexia (%)		Use for defecation (%)	Use for erection (% of male)
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After		
Austria	90 -> n=30	209 -> n=7	435 -> n=7	116 -> n=7	27 -> n=7	100 -> n=30	7 -> n=30	-	0 -> n=7	-	-	29 -> n=7	100 -> n=1
United Kingdom	73 -> n=22	-	-	-	-	-	32 -> n=22	-	-	-	-	50 (SARS alone) -> n=12	30 -> n=20
France	89.7 -> n=116	203 -> n=112	546.4 -> n=112	90 -> n=19	25 -> n=19	98.8 -> n=112	11.58 -> n=112	100 -> n=93	29 -> n=93	21.7 -> n=112	0 -> n=112	52.6 -> n=116	65.2 -> n=75
Spain	100 -> n=7	-	>400 in all patients -> n=7	-	<50 in all patients -> n=7	-	0 -> n=7	-	-	-	-	100 -> n=7	100 -> n=1
Netherlands	87.1 -> n=84	285.4 -> n=52	571.2 -> n=37	104.7 -> n=52	64.9 at one year -> n=37	90 (daytime) 96 (night) -> n=52	27 (daytime) 14 (night) at one year -> n=37	98 -> n=37	59 -> n=37	15.9 -> n=47	4.25 -> n=47	46.7 -> n=84	62.3 -> n=61
Switzerland	79.6 -> n=147	264.4 -> n=147	476.7 -> n=147	157 -> n=10	16 -> n=10	60.9 -> n=137	38.3 -> n=137	87.7 -> 147	51.7 -> n=147	62.6 -> n=147	7.5 -> n=147	-	-
North America	78 -> n=21	256.9 -> n=21	>401 -> n=21	159.6 -> n=21	85.7 -> n=21	82.6 -> n=21	64.8 -> n=21	100 -> n=21	78.3 -> n=21	34.8 -> n=21	8.7 -> n=21	61 (systematic use) -> n=21	-
Germany	86.2 -> n=333	173 -> n=464	470 -> n=464	-	-	86 -> n=287	52 -> n=287	6.3 per year -> n=464	1.2 per year -> n=464	40.3 -> n=464	0.4 -> n=464	73 -> 287	-
South America	90.5 -> n=120	-	362 -> n=104	-	<50 -> n=120	100 -> n=104	14.4 -> n=104	91 -> n=104	15 -> n=104	66.3 -> n=104	5.8 -> n=104	88.8 -> n=120	66.7 -> n=72

-> n = total number of implanted individuals with available information for each area

Table 3 - Implantation procedure and reliability axis (geographic areas)

Author	Deafferentation and Implantation procedure	Complications following surgery	Implant failures	Impact on patients everyday life and long term side effects	Additional information
Austria ->N=30	SARS implantation and deafferentation of roots for whom anterior component induced detrusor contractions – first patients – then extension to all sacral posterior roots. 26 intradural implant and 4 extradural implantation	- Second deafferentation (n=5) -> successful procedure for 4 of them	-	- Suspicion of Wallerian degeneration in one patient for whom electromicturition was impossible at the time of the study	- Severe autonomic dysreflexia disappeared in on patient - Statement claiming that SARS procedure improved all patients Quality of life as well as no patient has regretted the operation
United Kingdom ->N=24	Intradural implantation in all cases with or without S2-S4 rhizotomy – e.g. 9 implantation with and 3 without deafferentation in Sheffield group (n=12)	- Suspicion of anterior roots damage (n=2) - Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=2)	-	- Patient with pelvic pain awaiting for rhizotomy (n=1) - Somatic muscle spasms (n=1, preventing implant-driven micturition) - Muscle spasms when using SARS implant for erection (n=6 -> never used for sexual purposes) - Sphincterotomy proposed (n=4 -> two refused and did not use the implant) - Hydronephrosis pre-implantation (n=4): * Resolved in two cases * One patient relapsed * Grade IV reflux with urgent sphincterotomy in one patients - Spine fractures due to the laminectomy led to intractable spasms and cessation of implant use (n=1) - Infection leading to complete removal of the device 2 years after implantation (n=1)	- No constipation and reduced time for bowel evacuation reported by the Sheffield group
France ->N=116	- Intradural rhizotomy and implantation (n=103) – Intradural rhizotomy and extradural implantation (n=13)	- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=6) - Nearly complete denervation (n=5, intradural implantation, stimulator could be use after recovery in 3 patients) - Neuropraxia (n=1) -> Recovery after few months (n=1) - Partial denervation (n=5, with good results few months post-implantation) - Second deafferentation (n=4) - Discomfort at the subcutaneous receptor (subsequently displaced, n=2)	- Extradural implantation due to intradural electrode failure (n=1) - Replacement of receiver block (n=6) - Cable failures (n=4) - Cable disconnection (n=4) - Charger failure (n=3)	- Transitory spasticity was mentioned but not quantitatively documented. - Infection leading to implant removal (n=2) - Deterioration of detrusor responses (n=5) - Bladder fibrosis (n=1) - Persistent sphincter dyssynergia (n=3, patient refused sphincterotomy or conus deafferentation) - Persistent Wallerian degeneration (n=1) - Second sphincterotomy (n=4, all continent) - Pyelonephritis (n=1) - Renal problems led to nephrotomy (n=1)	Benefit: - Preoperative vesicoureteral reflux disappeared (n=3)
Spain ->N=7	Extradural implantation and deafferentation at the conus medullaris in all patients	The receiver block was placed too low in patient abdominal wall and broke through the skin (n=1) -> It was replaced higher up	-	-	Benefit: - Upper urinary tract dilatation improved in one patient

Netherlands ->N=84	Intradural sacral posterior rhizotomy (S2-S5) and intradural SARS implantation in all patients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Second deafferentation (n=3)</li> <li>- Neuropraxie (n=1)</li> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=3)</li> <li>- Wound infection (n=1)</li> <li>- Nerve damage (n=2)</li> <li>* 1 permanent</li> <li>* 1 recovered</li> <li>- Detrusor weakness (n=4) -&gt; Problems solved several years after surgery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- External equipment (n=23 in total)</li> <li>* Cable fracture (n=16)</li> <li>* Transmitter defects (n=7)</li> <li>- Internal equipment (n=4 in total).</li> <li>* 3 receiver replacements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong lower limbs contractions during stimulation-induced erection (n=12)</li> <li>- Strong motor responses to stimulation (n=1)</li> <li>- Fibrosis around sacral roots (n=2)</li> <li>- Root failures (n=1, but deafferentation enable complete continence)</li> <li>- Detrusor weakness (n=2)</li> <li>- Sphincter weakness (n=1)</li> <li>- Implant infection (n=1) -&gt; Replacement of the intradural implant by an extradural one</li> <li>- AHR induced by stimulation (n=2)</li> <li>- Intrathecal baclofen pump (n=2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stimulation-induced erections not used for sexual intercourse</li> <li>- Upper urinary tract dilatation solved in 2 patients</li> <li>- Creatinine clearance returned to normal values after implantation (n=32)</li> <li>- Preoperative vesicoureteral reflux was reduced (n=1) or disappeared (n=1)</li> <li>- No interference between SARS and baclofen pump</li> </ul>
Switzerland ->N=147	Intradural implantation and deafferentation S2 to S5 in all cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incomplete rhizotomy (n=8) with second deafferentation (n=4)</li> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=8)</li> <li>- Infection (n=3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Defect of cables (n=19)</li> <li>- Defect of stimulation plate (n=19)</li> <li>- Dislocation of the stimulator plate (n=16)</li> <li>- Undetermined cause of stimulator failure (n=15)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Additional urological interventions in 43 patients</li> <li>* 22 Outlet obstruction</li> <li>* 10 Vesicoureteral reflux</li> <li>* 10 Incontinence</li> <li>* 9 Urethral strictures</li> <li>- Problems with condom fixation (n=3)</li> <li>- AHR persisted and occurred during implant-driven voiding despite complete sacral deafferentation (n=8)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 54 patients, a total of 83 surgical revisions were performed (17 patients underwent more than one revision)</li> </ul>
North America ->N=21	Extradural implantation and intradural rhizotomy S2-S5 in all cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Temporary nerve damage (n=2, recovery within 3 months)</li> <li>- Incomplete rhizotomy with second deafferentation (n=1)</li> </ul>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased lower limb spasticity (n=2)</li> <li>- Infection leading to complete removal of the device 26 years after implantation (n=1)</li> <li>- Increase in incontinence episodes (n=4)</li> <li>- Fracture of the second lumbar vertebra 5 months after surgery which caused compression of the cauda equina (n=1)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Benefit:</li> <li>- Reduced time for bowel evacuation</li> </ul>
Germany ->N=440	Intradural deafferentation and implantation. Rhizotomy performed in all surgery with a success rate of 95.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leak (n=6)</li> <li>- Infection of the implant (n=5) with further reimplantation in 4 cases</li> <li>- Dehiscent wound (n=2)</li> <li>- Hemorrhages (n=2, no further treatment)</li> <li>- Second rhizotomy (n=8 at conus terminlis to interrupt dysreflexia)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 81 Implant defects</li> <li>-&gt; 44 repair surgeries</li> <li>* 26 Receiver exchange and cable repair</li> <li>* 6 Cable repair alone</li> <li>* 12 Extradural implant with 1 withdrawal due to an infection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bladder overdistension and neurogenic failures are mentioned but not quantitatively documented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bladder spasticity stopped in 97% of all cases.</li> <li>- Recovery of kidney function is mentioned</li> </ul>
South America ->N=120	Extradural implantation and posterior rhizotomy of S2-S5 sacral roots (n=104) or S2-S4 roots (n=16)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neuropraxia with spontaneous resolution after 12 months (n=2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Failure of the receiver block (n=1)</li> <li>- Malfunction/damage of the external hardware mostly due to operator misuse (n=10)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Infections few months after implantation (n=2)</li> <li>- Cable extrusion (n=2)</li> <li>- Extrusion of the receiver block (n=4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stimulation-induced erections rarely used for sexual intercourse</li> </ul>

-> N = total number of implanted individuals with available information for each area; n = number of corresponding adverse events for each area

Table 4 - Patient's quality of life

Author	Population	Survey modalities	Results
Wielink et al, 1997	52 implanted patients. Questionnaires completed at baseline, 3 months, 6 months and 1 year follow-up	Final survey designed by using 4 indicators - the Nottingham Health Profile - the Karnofsky Performance Index - the Affect Balance Scale - Self-developed items  + Cost effectiveness study	<u>Quality of life:</u> - The Nottingham Health Profile covers several aspects such as "energy", "sleep", "emotional reaction" and "social isolation". It did not show significant improvement after implantation. - The Karnofsky Performance Index, initially designed in cancer research to quantify "objective" quality of life aspects, did not show significant improvement after implantation. - The Affect Balance Scale assessing experienced well-being improved significantly after SARS implantation. - Before implantation patients showed problems with bladder emptying and incontinence especially during everyday life tasks.  <u>Cost-effectiveness:</u> - Costs of treatment with SARS are high in the first 2.5 years (implantation surgery and stay in hospital) - These SARS costs are earned back after 8 years compared to conventional treatment costs. - The saving of money increases with the long term effects
Creasey et al, 2001	18 implanted patients whose completed a 6-month follow-up	User satisfaction survey designed by the authors	<u>6 Items with 5 possible responses (Strongly agree / Agree / Neutral / Disagree / Strongly disagree):</u> - Patient satisfaction *SA: 67% *A: 28% *N: 0% *D: 5% *SD: 0% - Quality of life improvement *SA: 44% *A: 50% *N: 5% *D: 0% *SD: 0% - Correspondence with patients expectations *SA: 29% *A: 59% *N: 0% *D: 12% *SD: 0% - Improvement in patient independence *SA: 39% *A: 39% *N: 22% *D: 0% *SD: 0% - System ease of use *SA: 28% *A: 61% *N: 0% *D: 11% *SD: 0% - Reduction in urinary tract infections *SA: 44% *A: 33% *N: 6% *D: 11% *SD: 6%
Vastenholt et al, 2003	Comparison between two populations: - 37 implanted patients with a 7 years follow-up period - 400 SCI patients whose results are reported in the manual of the Qualiveen questionnaire	Use of the Qualiveen questionnaire which is a disease specific questionnaire composed of two parts: - Impact of urinary problems - Quality of life of SCI patients  + Patient expectations	<u>Qualiveen results:</u> - Impact of urinary problems on patients quality of life is smaller in the implanted patients group compared to the control group. - The overall quality of life is higher in implanted patients versus control patients  <u>Patient's experiences and expectations:</u> - Patients expectations with respect to micturition: *Expectations met: 62% *Partially met: 32% - Concerning defecation: *Expectations met: 38% *Partially met: 30% - Use of SARS for erection in male patients: *Expectations met: 47%  Almost 90% patient would chose again for surgery and would recommend implantation
Martens et al, 2011	Comparison between 3 populations: - Brindley group (n=46)	Survey designed with 3 components: - the Qualiveen questionnaire	<u>Qualiveen questionnaire</u> - Impact of urinary problems: * Patients who used SARS mentioned less limitations, constraints, fears and bad feelings concerning their urinary problems. - Overall quality of life:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Rhizotomy group (Brindley procedure without use of the implant – n=27)</li> <li>- Control group (n=28)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the SF-36 which measures the general health</li> <li>- Questions regarding urinary tract infections and continence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Better general quality of life for the Brindley group</li> <li>* Better general quality of life for the rhizotomy group compared to the control group but not statistically significant.</li> <li>- Brindley group &gt; Rhizotomy group &gt; Control group</li> </ul> <p><u>SF-36 Questionnaire:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Higher scores in Brindley group versus Rhizotomy group and control group indicating better general health and social functioning</li> </ul> <p><u>Clinical results:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continence rate (% of patients totally continent):</li> </ul> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>*Brindley group</td> <td>*Rhizotomy group</td> <td>*Control group</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">52%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">33%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">14%</td> </tr> </table> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urinary tract infections (% of patients without infections):</li> </ul> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td>*Brindley group</td> <td>*Rhizotomy group</td> <td>*Control group</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">50%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">15%</td> <td style="text-align: center;">36%</td> </tr> </table>	*Brindley group	*Rhizotomy group	*Control group	52%	33%	14%	*Brindley group	*Rhizotomy group	*Control group	50%	15%	36%
*Brindley group	*Rhizotomy group	*Control group													
52%	33%	14%													
*Brindley group	*Rhizotomy group	*Control group													
50%	15%	36%													
<p>Rasmussen et al, 2015 and Zaer et al, 2018</p>	<p>587 implanted patients. Questionnaires completed by 333 patients and only responses from those who are using the SARS for bowel function were analyzed in Rasmussen et al (n=277 – 145 males and 132 females) while only those using the SARS for bladder function were analyzed in Zaer et al (n=287– 154 males and 133 females).</p>	<p>Combination of data from both showed results from 7 indicators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 for overall satisfaction: Visual analog scale (VAS),</li> <li>- 1 for bladder function: VAS</li> <li>- 1 for sexual function: VAS (n=284 – 154 males and 130 females)</li> <li>- 4 assessing bowel function: VAS for overall severity of bowel symptoms; Neurogenic bowel dysfunction score; St Marks incontinence score and Cleveland constipation score</li> </ul>	<p><u>Overall satisfaction:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VAS ranged from 0 (worst) to 10 (best). For the subject that are still using their implant, the median VAS score was 10 (range: 0-10).</li> </ul> <p><u>Bladder function (for individuals using their implant):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VAS ranged from 0 (minor) to 10 (major nuisance). VAS score dropped from 9 (range: 7-10) at baseline to 3 (1-5) at follow up.</li> </ul> <p><u>Sexual function (for individuals using their implant):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VAS ranged from 0 (no satisfaction) to 10 (no problems).</li> <li>Males: No statistical difference between before and after (0.41 versus 0.47) even if males ability of performing intercourse decreased.</li> <li>Females: slightly decrease from 6 (range: 0-10) to 5 (0-10) without reaching statistical significance. In the same way, no statistical difference between before and after regarding capability of orgasm, usage of sexual aids or medicine and ability of having sexual intercourse.</li> </ul> <p><u>Bowel symptoms (for individuals using their implant):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- VAS for overall severity of bowel symptoms, range 0 (worst) to 10 (best), was 6 (range: 4-8) before implantation and 4 (2-6) at follow up.</li> <li>- Neurogenic bowel dysfunction score (0-6 very minor, 7-9 minor, 10-13 moderate, 14+ severe dysfunction) was 17 (range: 11-21) before SARS procedure and 11 (9-15) at follow-up.</li> <li>- St Marks incontinence score (0=perfect continence, 24=totally incontinence) remains 4 before and after implantation (range: 0-7 and 0-5 respectively).</li> <li>- Cleveland constipation score (0=minimal, 30=worst constipation) slightly decrease from 7 (range: 6-10) at baseline to 6 (4-8) at follow-up.</li> </ul>												


Table 5 – Additional information

Author	Deafferentation	General description
Kirkham et al, 2002	- Extradural (80%) or intradural (20%) implantation of SARS - No rhizotomy	Implantation of SARS implant on both anterior and posterior roots for neuromodulation purposes. In all patient, stimulation increase bladder capacity and reflex erection was preserved. However, micturition was only elicited in one patient - Patient for whom micturition cannot be for sure imputed to implant use.
Soni et al, 2004	intradural implantation of SARS and S2, S3 and S4 posterior roots rhizotomy	A patient using SARS implant for micturition noticed progressively increasing spasms. These spasms required intrathecal baclofen therapy but subsequent lumbar spine fractures – L4 and L5 vertebral bodies – led to intractable spasms and to cessation of implant use.
Vaidyanathan et al, 2009	- Intradural rhizotomy and implantation	Person with SCI with a history of bladder calculus underwent sacral deafferentation and SARS implantation. Chronic infections by Pseudomonas aeruginosa led to implant removal, causing loss of bladder emptying. Deafferentation and failed implantation induced severe constipation and loss of – reflex – penile erection. The long-term consequences of unsuccessful bladder stimulator surgery had dramatic effects on patient quality of life.
Pannek et al, 2010	Intradural rhizotomy without implantation	S2 to S5 deafferentation as a salvage procedure in a patient with life-threatening autonomic dysreflexia. This bladder-triggered dysreflexia even leading to cardiac arrest, it was decided to perform sacral deafferentation to prevent further critical episodes. The patient nevertheless rejected any implant and 3 month after surgery declare himself content with suprapubic catheter while no episodes of autonomic dysreflexia occurred.
Sanders et al, 2011	NA <sup>a</sup>	Patient preferences for next generation of neural prostheses. A fractional factorial study was designed to identify patient preferences regarding new neuroprosthetic devices. This study aimed to identify the key features for implant attractiveness and compared three stimulation modalities: Brindley implant, pudendal nerve stimulation and Brindley system without dorsal rhizotomy. In a nutshell, “side effects” and invasiveness seemed to be the most important features while patient preferences established the following ranking: Brindley system without dorsal rhizotomy > pudendal nerve stimulation > Brindley implant.
De Heredia et al, 2012	NA <sup>a</sup>	Investigation of MRI exams impact on SARS implant in 18 patients. A total of 44 MRI examinations were performed, 34 at 0.2 Tesla and 21 at 1.5 Tesla. Side effects: Two MRI on the same patient were stopped due to interference with the SARS (toe movements at 0.2 Tesla, a subsequent MRI at 1.5 Tesla was performed without complications). No other adverse effects could be directly attributed to MRI exams.
Bramall et al, 2016	- Intradural implantation of SARS - No rhizotomy	Person with SCI remained incontinent after SARS implantation leading his physician to remove the receiver block while leaving the electrodes and associated wires. Repeated skin breakdown with wired extrusion happened in subsequent patient medical history ultimately leading to a chronic Staphylococcus aureus infection and sacral osteomyelitis 26 years after implantation. Definitive management involved complete removal of the device and the intradural phlegmon as well as ligation of the thecal sac and flap reconstruction.
Krebs et al, 2016	- Intradural rhizotomy and implantation	Long-term follow up of detrusor contractions in spinal cord injured individuals implanted with sacral anterior root stimulator (mean follow-up=11.7 years). Detrusor pressures induced by stimulation decreased over time without reaching statistical significance. This decrease neither resulted in an increase in the number of daily stimulation-induced voiding nor in an increase in residual urine after voiding. The origin of the deterioration of bladder contraction remains unknown even if neurogenic deterioration in the wake of SCI, long-term SAR or aging are likely to be incriminated.

<sup>a</sup>NA: Not applicable


Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

Supplementary Fig.1 – Cochrane’s Risk of Bias in Non-randomized Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) plot



Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

Supplementary Fig.2 – Articles characteristics. a) Distribution of the selected publications classified according to their topics and their year of publication, b) Strength of evidence of the selected articles





Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

Supplementary Tab.1 – Study and patient characteristics (all studies)

Authors	Number of patients / % of male patient	Mean age in years (*)	Lesion profile T – Tetraplegia P – Paraplegia	% of complete SCI	Mean age of the lesion at the time of implantation (in years)	Patients follow up after implantation (in years)	Study type	Level of evidence
Madersbacher et al, 1988	7/14	26.3 [17-45]	Trauma: 7 T – 3 / P – 4	86	1.86 [1-3]	- [0.5-2]	RS	IV
Robinson et al, 1988	22 / 91	-	Trauma: 22 T – 7 / P – 15	91	4.5 [1-22]	-	RS	IV
Brindley et al, 1990	50 / 76	32.08 [57-19] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 48 T – 10 / P – 38 MS: 2	77.08	-	- [5-11]	RS	IV
MacDonagh et al, 1990	12 / 75	-	Trauma: 12 T – 2 / P – 10	100	> 2	2.2 [0.25-6]	PS	III
Sauerwein et al, 1990	12 / 50	36 [24-52] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 12 T – 1 / P – 11	83.3	9 [1-27]	1.31 [2.5-0.08]	RS	IV
Barat et al, 1993	9 / -	-	-	-	-	-	RS – SC	V
Egon et al, 1993	30 / 70	-	-	-	-	-	RS – SC	V
Madersbacher et al, 1993	30 / 27	-	Trauma: 30 T – 10 / P – 20	97	-	< 8	RS	V
Sarrias et al, 1993	7 / 14.3	-	Trauma: 7 T – 3 / P – 4	-	-	-	RS – SC	V
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995	500 / 54.2	-	Trauma: 378 T – 122 / P – 256 Unspecified : 98	85.5	-	4.07 [0.25-16.1]	RS	III
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1996	52 / 55.8	32.9 [16-57] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 52 T – 11 / P – 41	100	6.25 [0.75-22.5]	3.2 [0.25-6.33]	RS	IV
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1997 and Wielink et al, 1997	52 / 78.85	28.5 [16-54] <sup>ab</sup>	Trauma: 52 T – 11 / P – 41	100	6.4 [0.75-24.8]	1.14	PS	III
Egon et al, 1998	96 / 73.1	38.9 [23-66] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 96 T – 41 / P – 55	82.3	6.67 [1-21]	5.52 [0.5-14]	RS	IV
Schurch et al, 1998	10 / 30	28.7 [18-42] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 10 T – 5 / P – 5	90	5.23 [1.2-16.7]	3.8 [1.92-6.03]	RS	III
Van der Aa et al, 1999	38 / 86.8	35.03 [18-59] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 38 T – 9 / P – 29	100	6.95 [1-39]	- [0.25-12]	RS	III
Bauchet et al, 2001	20 / 30	34 [17-53] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 20 T – 6 / P – 14	100	6,25 [1.25-23.83]	4.5 [1-8.5]	RS	III
Creasey et al, 2001	23 / 70	40 [14-67] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 23 T – 6 / P – 17	100	7 [2-26]	> 1 year but some results are missing	PS	III
Kirkham et al, 2002	5 / 100	37.2 [32-46] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 5 P – 5	100	8.4	-	RA	IV
Sauerwein et al, 2003	427 / 33	34 <sup>a</sup>	Unspecified: 427	-	-	6.2	RS – SC	V
Vastenholt et al, 2003	37 / 86.52	43	Trauma: 47	100	7.25	7.1	CSS	II

		[23-63] <sup>b</sup>	T – 14 / P – 23		[0.9-39.25]	[1.3-13.25]		
Hamel et al, 2004	4/100	-	Unspecified: 4 T – 1 / P – 3	100	-	- [0.5-1.75]	RS	IV
Soni et al, 2004	1 / 100	46 <sup>a°</sup>	-	100	17	8	CR	V
Kutzenberger et al, 2005	464 / 31	-	Unspecified: 464 P – 464	-	-	6.6 [0.5-17]	RS – SC	IV
Kutzenberger, 2007	464/53	33 [14-67] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 436 Other specified causes: 28 T – 190 / P – 274	75	[0.5-46]	8.6 [1.5-18]	RS	IV
Vaidyanathan et al, 2009	1/100	23	Trauma: 1 T – 1	100	3	13	CR	V
Pannek et al, 2010	1 / 100	53 <sup>a°</sup>	Trauma: 1 P – 1	100	34 - rhizotomy only	0.25	CR	V
Martens et al, 2011	Group #1 -Brindley 46 / 78	48 [33-67] <sup>b</sup>	Unspecified: 46	-	8	13 [1-19]	CSS	II
	Group #2 -Rhizotomy 27 / 81	47 [26-66] <sup>b</sup>	Unspecified: 27	-	5	14 [3-21]		
	Group #3 - Control 28 / 79	42 [20-75] <sup>b</sup>	Unspecified: 28	100	NA	NA		
Sanders et al, 2011	66 / 89.4	50.6 (sd :1.9) <sup>b</sup>	Trauma: 66 T – 38 / P – 28	31.6	NA	NA	RA	IV
De Heredia et al, 2012	18 / 66.6	First MRI: 46 [24-69]	Unspecified: 18 T – 2 / P – 16	-	7 [1-18]	0.5 years after MRI exam	RS	IV
Krasmik et al, 2014	137 / 59.1	40 (sd: 12.4) <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 137 T – 53 / P – 84	96.35	11.6 (sd: 10.2)	14.8 (sd: 5.3)	RS	III
Bramall et al, 2016	1/100	36	Trauma: 1 P – 1	100	14	26	CR	V
Castano-Boreto et al, 2016	104 / 91.3	38 (sd:10) <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 103 Unspecified: 1 T – 34 / P – 70	92.3	6.5 (sd: 4.9)	-	RS	III
Krebs et al, 2016	111/53	-	Unspecified: T – 39 / P – 72	-	8.6	11.7 [5-24.9]	RS	IV
Rasmussen et al, 2015 and Zaer et al, 2018	587/57	34.9	Trauma: 561 Other specified causes: 26 T – 266 / P – 321	84.5	8.9 [0-49]	14.6 [1-25]	CSS	III
Ramos et al, 2020	16/81	43 [31-59] <sup>a</sup>	Unspecified: 16 T – 8 / P – 8	-	-	4.4	RS-SC	V

<sup>a</sup> is the age at time of implantation, <sup>b</sup> corresponds to the age at interview completion and <sup>°</sup> are absolute values instead of mean values. [] corresponds to data range. (sd) corresponds to data standard deviation. RS: Retrospective Study, PS: Prospective study, SC: Short Communication, CR: Case Report, CSS: Cross-sectional study, RA: Research Article. NA: Not Applicable.

Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

Supplementary Tab.2 – Benefits for visceral functions (all studies)

Author	Use of SARS for micturition (%)	Bladder capacity (ml)		Residual urine (ml)		Incontinent episodes (%)		Urinary tract infections		Autonomic dysreflexia (%)		Use for defecation (%)	Use for erection (%)
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After		
Madersbacher et al, 1988 (n=7)	100	209 [80-350]	350< [350-500<]	130 [50-200]	27 [10-40]	-	-	-	0	-	-	29	100 (1/1 male)
Robinson et al, 1988 (n=22)	73	-	-	-	-	-	32	-	-	-	-	-	30 (6/20 males)
Brindley et al, 1990 (n=48) <sup>a</sup>	85.4	-	-	-	-	-	44 (SARS users)	-	29.2% (SARS users)	-	-	56.2	43.2 (16/37 males)
MacDonagh et al, 1990 (n=12)	100	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	50 (SARS alone)	-
Sauerwein et al, 1990 (n=12)	75	-	565	-	<50 in 75% of patients	75	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
Egon et al, 1993 (n=30)	90	-	-	-	<50 in 83% of patients	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Madersbacher et al, 1993 (n=30)	90	-	-	-	<50	100	7	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sarrias et al, 1993 (n=7)	100	-	>400 in all patients	-	<50 in all patients	-	0	-	-	-	-	100	100 (1 male patient)
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995 (n=479) <sup>a</sup>	86.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1996 (n=47) <sup>a</sup>	87.2	-	590 (sd: 104) [374-792]	-	<50 in all patients	-	8.5	4.2 per year [2-12]	1.4 per year [0-2]	15.9	4.25	36.2	62 (18/29 males)
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1997 and Wielink et al, 1997 (n=52)	100	285.4 [20-780]	571.2 [260-806]	104.7 [0-600]	45.6 [0-600] at one year (n=31)	90 (daytime) 96 (night)	21 (daytime) 12 (night) at one year	92% 1.94 per year [0-15]	27% 0.31 at one year [0-3]	13.5	5.8	Clear benefit mentioned for 2/3 of the patients	78 (32/41 males)
Egon et al, 1998 (n=93) <sup>a</sup>	89.3	206	564	-	-	98.6	11.8	100	29	22.9	0	54.8	70.8 (46/65)
Schurch et al, 1998 (n=10)	100	160 (sd: 82)	>500 in all cases	157 (sd: 138)	16 (sd: 22)	100	-	80%	60%	80	80	-	-
Van der Aa et al, 1999 (n=37) <sup>a</sup>	91.9	>400 in 24% of patients (9/37)	>400 in 94.6% of patients (35/37)	>60 in 78.8%	<60 in 73%	-	16.2	-	-	-	-	73	87.9 (29/33 males)

Bauchet et al, 2001 (n=19) <sup>a</sup>	89.5	190 [40-600]	460 [350-800]	90 [0-500]	25 [0-90]	100	10.5	100	-	15.8	0	42.1	0 (0/6 males)
Creasey et al, 2001 (n=21) <sup>a</sup>	78	256,9	>401	159.6	85.7	82.6	64.8 (11/17)	100 %	78.3%	34.8	8.7	61 (systematic use)	-
Sauerwein et al, 2003 (n=427)	98	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.4 per year	1.2 per year	-	-	95	-
Vastenholt et al, 2003 (n=37)	87	-	-	-	-	-	43 (daytime) 30 % (night)	98%	59%	-	-	60 - clear benefit in stool evacuation	62.5 (20/32 males)
Hamel et al, 2004 (n=4)	100	-	>400 in all patients	-	<50 in all patients	-	25	-	-	-	-	50	75 but not used (3/4 males)
Kutzenberger et al, 2005 (n=464)	90.5	173	470	-	-	-	17	6.3 per year	1.2 per year	40.3	0.4	86.4	-
Kutzenberger, 2007 (n= 440)	95.4	173	476	-	-	-	17	6.3/year	1.2/year	-	0.4	91	-
Krasmik et al, 2014 (n=137)	78.1	272 (sd: 143)	475 (sd: 83)	-	96 (sd: 177)	60.9	38.3	88.3% 6.2 per year (sd: 4.5)	51.1% 2.5 per year (sd: 2.6)	61.3	2.2	-	-
Castano-Boreto et al, 2016 (n=104)	91	-	362 (sd : 108)	-	<50	100	14.4	91%	15%	66.3	5.8	88	64.2 (61/95 males)
Rasmussen et al, 2015 and Zaer et al, 2018 (n=333/287)	86.2	-	-	-	-	86	52	-	-	-	-	73	-
Ramos et al, 2020 (n=16)	87.5	-	-	-	<50 in all patients	-	-	-	37.5 (SARS users)	-	-	94	85 (11/13 males)

<sup>a</sup>Number of patients that completed the follow-up period (when different from the total number of patients involved in the initial study -> Figures related to bladder functions were then computed based on this number)

Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

Supplementary Tab.3 – Implantation procedure and reliability axis (all studies)

Author	Deafferentation and Implantation procedure	Complications following surgery	Implant failures	Impact on patients everyday life and long term side effects	Additional information
Robinson et al, 1988 (n=22)	-	Neuropraxia (n=1)	-	- Patient with pelvic pain awaiting for rhizotomy (n=1) - Somatic muscle spasms (n=1, preventing implant-driven micturition) - Muscle spasms when using SARS implant for erection (n=6 -> Implant never used for sexual purposes) - Sphincterotomy proposed (n=4 -> two refused and did not use the implant) - Hydronephrosis pre-implantation (n=4): * Resolved in two cases * One patient relapsed * Grade IV reflux with urgent sphincterotomy in one patients	-
Brindley et al, 1990 (n=48)	-	-	- 37.5% of patients reported implant failures --> 25 failures in total - Receiver block failure (n=7) - New implantation due to cable break (n=1) - Cable break (n=5) - Connector failures (n=12)	- 17% of users noted increased spasms - Backache (n=2) - Stimulus pain (n=1) - Pain leading patient to stop implant use (n=2) - Increased sweating (n=6) - Occasional headache (n=1) - Occasional autonomic dysreflexia (n=1) - Loss of reflex erections (n=8) - Increased constipation (n=4)	-
MacDonagh et al, 1990 (n=12)	Intradural implantation in all cases and S2-S4 rhizotomy in 75% of patients	- Suspicion of anterior roots damage (n=2) - Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=2)	-	-	- No reports of constipation in any patients Benefit: - Reduced time for bowel evacuation in any patient
Sauerwein et al, 1990 (n=12)	Initially: -Intradural implantation without rhizotomy (16.7% of patients) -> Implants replaced by extradural devices with extradural rhizotomy Finally: -Extradural implant and extradural rhizotomy in all patients	- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=1) - Root damage in all patients (n=12) - Incomplete deafferentation (n=2 and one more is suspected).	-	-	-

Barat et al, 1993 (n=9)	Deafferentation in all patients but 3 incomplete procedure (without S2 or S4 cutting)	-	-	- Stress incontinence (n=3) - Reflex incontinence (n=3) - Mixed incontinence (n=2) - Second deafferentation needed in 3 patients (spread to S1 in two cases)	Benefit: - 3 patients recovered continence
Egon et al, 1993 (n=30)	-	- Major denervation -> Nearly complete bladder denervation (n=2, maximal recovery after 1 year) - Neuropraxia (n=1) -> Recovery after few months (n=1) - Partial denervation (n=5, with good results few months post-implantation)	-	- Secondary loss of bladder contractions (n=3)	-
Madersbacher et al, 1993 (n=30)	SARS implantation and deafferentation of roots for whom anterior component induced detrusor contractions – in first patients – then extension to all sacral posterior roots with better results. 27 intradural implant and 4 extradural implantation	Suspicion of Wallerian degeneration in one patient for whom electromyography was impossible at the time of the study	-	- Second deafferentation (n=5) -> successful procedure for 4 of them	- Severe autonomic dysreflexia disappeared in one patient - Statement claiming that SARS procedure improved all patients Quality of life as well as no patient has regretted the operation
Sarras et al, 1993 (n=7)	Extradural implantation and deafferentation at the conus medullaris in all patients	The receiver block was placed too low in patient abdominal wall and one of the device corners broke through one of the skin creases (n=1) -> It was replaced higher up and cause no further trouble	-	-	Benefit: - Patient satisfaction - one patient with upper urinary tract dilatation showed improvement after 6 months of implant-driven micturition.
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995 (n=479)	- Implantation: * 88.2 % intradural * 4.6% Extradural * 7.2% Unknown - Rhizotomy: * 73.6% Rhizotomy * 10.4% No rhizotomy * 16% Unknown	- Infection following surgery and device explantation (n=3)	- Implant failures in 72 of the 500 first patients * 56 repairs + 21 second failures ▪ 9 replaced ▪ 12 repaired + 3 third failures ▪ 1 replaced ▪ 2 repaired * 9 replaced by a new stimulator with extradural electrodes + 2 failures ▪ 2 repaired * 5 Implant needed no repair since implant-driven micturition remained good	- Infection and explantation during follow-up (n=1) - Exposition of the receiver block (n=5) - 95 surgery performed to remedy faults in implant: * 75 repair procedures (cables, receiver block) -> These operations were followed by infections in two cases. * 20 implantations of a new device -> followed by infection and explantation in one case. - Death due to renal failure (n=1) - Deterioration of the upper urinary tract (n=11) -> Including one patient deceased from carcinomatosis, primary in the bladder - Second deafferentation (n=39) - Spinal roots deterioration during follow up (n=8)	-

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* 2 waiting to be repaired</li> <li>- Total number of failures = 98</li> <li>* 18 receiver failures</li> <li>* 18 connector failures</li> <li>* 3 cable fractures</li> <li>* 42 cables outside their receiver blocks</li> <li>* 17 Unknown</li> </ul>	- Failures of implant driven micturition due to overstretching of bladder wall (n=5) -> recovery in all cases.	
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1996 (n=47)	Intradural implantation and posterior rhizotomy in all cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=2)</li> <li>- Wound infection (n=1)</li> <li>- Nerve damage (n=2)</li> <li>* 1 permanent</li> <li>* 1 recovered</li> </ul>	-No implant failure (only mention of minor problems with the external control boxes)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Spasticity return to preoperative levels</li> <li>- Second deafferentation (n=3)</li> <li>- Implant infection (n=1) -&gt; Replacement of the intradural implant by an extradural one</li> <li>- AHR induced by stimulation (n=2)</li> <li>- Strong lower limbs contraction s during stimulation-induced erection (n=12)</li> <li>- Intrathecal baclofen pump (n=2)</li> </ul>	<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upper urinary tract dilatation solved in 2 patients</li> <li>- Creatinine clearance returned to normal values after implantation (n=32)</li> <li>- Preoperative vesicoureteral reflux was reduced (n=1) or disappeared (n=1)</li> <li>- No interference between SARS and baclofen pump</li> </ul>
Van kerrebroeck et al, 1997 and Wielink et al, 1997 (n=52)	Intradural implantation and intradural sacral posterior root rhizotomy (S2, S3 and S4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Difficulties to split anterior and posterior roots (n=3) -&gt; Persistent reflex post-operatively needed second deafferentation</li> <li>- Persistent neuropraxia (n=1, resolved at 18 months)</li> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minor problems with the external control box are mentioned</li> <li>- Cable fracture (n=1, 18 months after surgery)</li> </ul>		<p>Benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upper urinary tract dilatation solved in 2 patients (6 weeks after rhizotomy)</li> <li>- Vesicoureteral reflux observed in 6 ureters in 4 patients improved in all cases</li> </ul>
Egon et al, 1998 (n=93)	- 90.7% Intradural implantation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=3)</li> <li>- Nearly complete denervation (n=5, intradural implantation, stimulator could be use after recovery in 3 patients)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Receivers failure (n=5, all were replaced)</li> <li>- Cable failures (n=4)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transitory spasticity was mentioned but not quantitatively documented. In some cases, ablation of S1 and L5 posterior roots to abolish triceps surae spasticity</li> <li>- Infection leading to implant removal (n=2)</li> <li>- Second deafferentation in 4.3% of patients due to persistent detrusor reflex activity.</li> <li>- Deterioration of detrusor responses (n=5)</li> <li>- Persistent sphincter dyssynergia (n=3, patient refused sphincterotomy or conus deafferentation)</li> <li>- Persistent Wallerian degeneration (n=1)</li> <li>- Second sphincterotomy (n=4, all continent)</li> <li>- Renal problems led to nephrotomy (n=1)</li> </ul>	<p>Benefit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preoperative vesicoureteral reflux disappeared (n=3)</li> </ul>
Schurch et al, 1998 (n=10)	Intradural implantation and sacral deafferentation in all cases	- Surgical incomplete deafferentation (n=4)		- AHR persisted and occurred during implant-driven voiding despite complete sacral deafferentation (n=8 and unknown condition in 1 patient)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DSD resolved in all cases</li> <li>- No lower limb or trunk contraction during stimulation in all patients.</li> </ul>
Van der Aa et al, 1999	Intradural sacral posterior rhizotomy (S2-S5) and		-Receiver block failure (n=3)		

(n=37)*	intradural SARS implantation in all patients				
Bauchet et al 2001 (n=19)	Intradural implantation and S2/S3 rhizotomy with S4/S5 roots crushing in all cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leak (n=2)</li> <li>- Discomfort at the subcutaneous receptor (subsequently displaced, n=2)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extradural implantation due to intradural electrode failure (n=1)</li> <li>- Replacement of receiver block (n=1)</li> <li>- Cable disconnection (n=4)</li> <li>- Charger failure (n=3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bladder fibrosis (n=1)</li> <li>- Pyelonephritis (n=1)</li> </ul>	One woman cannot use her implant at work because of inappropriate toilets
Creasey et al, 2001 (n=23)	Extradural implantation and intradural rhizotomy S2-S5 in all cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Temporary nerve damage (n=2, recovery within 3 months)</li> </ul>	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased lower limb spasticity (n=2)</li> <li>- Incomplete rhizotomy with second deafferentation (n=1)</li> <li>- Increase in incontinence episodes (n=4)</li> <li>- Fracture of the second lumbar vertebra 5 months after surgery which caused compression of the cauda equina (n=1)</li> </ul>	Benefit: - Reduced time for bowel evacuation
Sauerwein et al, 2003 (n=427)	-	-	-	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bladder spasticity stopped in 97% of all cases.</li> <li>- Recovery of kidney function is mentioned</li> </ul>
Vastenholt et al, 2003 (n=37)	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=1)</li> <li>- Neuropraxie (n=1)</li> <li>- Detrusor weakness (n=4)</li> </ul> Problems solved several years after surgery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- External equipment (One failure per 17 and per 38 user-years, n=23)</li> <li>* Cable fracture (n=16)</li> <li>* Transmitter defects (n=7)</li> <li>- Internal equipment (One per 66 user-years, n=4 in total).</li> <li>* 3 receiver replacements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong motor responses to stimulation (n=1)</li> <li>- Fibrosis around sacral roots (n=2)</li> <li>- Root failures (n=1, but deafferentation enable complete continence)</li> <li>- Detrusor weakness (n=2)</li> <li>- Sphincter weakness (n=1)</li> </ul>	-Erection never used for sexual intercourse
Hamel et al, 2004	Intradural rhizotomy and extradural implantation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage spontaneously resolved (n=1)</li> </ul>	-	-	-
Kutzenberger et al, 2005 (n=464)	Deafferentation performed in all surgery with a success rate of 94.1%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leak (n=6)</li> <li>- Infection of the implant (n=5)</li> <li>- Dehiscent wound (n=2)</li> <li>- Hemorrhages (n=2, requiring no further treatment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 70 Implant defects -&gt; 34 repair surgery were necessary</li> <li>* 16 Receiver exchange and cable repair</li> <li>* 5 Cable repair alone</li> <li>* 9 Extradural implant</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Second deafferentation (n=8 to interrupt dysreflexia)</li> <li>- Bladder overdistension and neurogenic failures are mentioned but not quantitatively documented.</li> </ul>	-
Kutzenberger et al, 2007 (n=440)	Intradural deafferentation and implantation. Rhizotomy performed in all surgery with a success rate of 95.2%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cerebrospinal fluid leak (n=6)</li> <li>- Infection of the implant (n=5) with further reimplantation in 4 cases</li> <li>- Dehiscent wound (n=2)</li> <li>- Hemorrhages (n=2, requiring no further treatment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 81 Implant defects -&gt; 44 repair surgery were necessary</li> <li>* 26 Receiver exchange and cable repair</li> <li>* 6 Cable repair alone</li> <li>* 12 Extradural implant with 1 further withdrawal due to an infection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Second deafferentation (n=8 at conus terminis to interrupt dysreflexia)</li> <li>- Bladder overdistension and neurogenic failures are mentioned but not quantitatively documented.</li> </ul>	-



Krasmik et al, 2014 (n=137)	Intradural implantation and deafferentation S2 to S5 in all cases	- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=8) - Infection (n=3)	- Defect of cables (n=19) - Defect of stimulation plate (n=19) - Dislocation of the stimulator plate (n=16) - Undetermined cause of stimulator failure (n=15)	-Incomplete rhizotomy with second deafferentation at the conus medullaris (n=4) - Additional urological interventions in 43 patients * 22 Outlet obstruction * 10 Vesicoureteral reflux * 10 Incontinence * 9 Urethral strictures - Problems with condom fixation (n=3)	In 54 patients, a total of 83 surgical revisions were performed (17 patients underwent more than one revision)
Castano-Boreto et al, 2016 (n=104)	Extradural implantation and posterior rhizotomy of S2-S5 sacral roots in all cases	-	- Failure of the receiver block (n=1)	- Infections few months after implantation (n=2) - Cable extrusion (n=2) - Extrusion of the receiver block (n=2)	-
Ramos et al, 2020 (n=16)	SARS implantation and deafferentation S2 to S4 in all cases	Neuropraxia with spontaneous resolution after 12 months (n=2)	- Malfunction/damage of the external hardware mostly due to operator misuse (n=10)	- Extrusion of the receiver block (n=2)	- 85% of patient obtained stimulation-induced erections but only 2 use SARS (6 patients sexually active before SARS procedure – 4 using a penile prosthesis)

- : Not Documented.

Guiho T, Azevedo-Coste C, Bauchet L, Delleci C, Vignes JR, Guiraud, D, Fattal C. Forty Sacral Anterior Root Stimulation and visceral function outcomes in spinal cord injury – A systematic review of the literature over four decades, World Neurosurgery, 2021.

### Supplementary Tab.4 – Multicentric studies

#### Study and patients characteristics

Authors	Number of patients / % of male patient	Mean age in years (*)	Lesion profile T – Tetraplegia P – Paraplegia	% of complete SCI	Mean age of the lesion at the time of implantation (in years)	Patients follow up after implantation (in years)	Study type	Level of evidence
Sauerwein et al, 1990	12 / 50	36 [24-52] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 12 T – 1 / P – 11	83.3	9 [1-27]	1.31 [2.5-0.08]	RS	IV
Brindley et al, 1990	50 / 76	32.08 [57-19] <sup>a</sup>	Trauma: 48 T – 10 / P – 38 MS: 2	77.08	-	- [5-11]	RS	IV
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995	500 / 54.2	-	Trauma: 378 T – 122 / P – 256 Unspecified : 98	85.5	-	4.07 [0.25-16.1]	RS	III

#### Benefits on visceral functions

Author	Use of SARS for micturition (%)	Bladder volume (ml)		Residual urine (ml)		Incontinent episodes (%)		Urinary tract infections		Autonomic dysreflexia (%)		Use for defecation (%)	Use for erection (%)
		Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After	Before	After		
Sauerwein et al, 1990 (n=12)	75	-	565	-	<50 in 75% of patients	75	25	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brindley et al, 1990 (n=48) <sup>a</sup>	85.4	-	-	-	-	-	44 (SARS users)	-	29.2% (SARS users)	-	-	56.2	43.2 (16/37 males)
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995 (n=479) <sup>a</sup>	86.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

#### Implantation procedure and reliability axis

Author	Deafferentation and Implantation procedure	Complications following surgery	Implant failures	Impact on patients everyday life and long term side effects	Additional information
Sauerwein et al, 1990 (n=12)	Initially: -Intradural implantation without rhizotomy (16.7% of patients) ->	- Cerebrospinal fluid leakage (n=1)	-	-	-

	Implants replaced by extradural devices with extradural rhizotomy Finally: -Extradural implant and extradural rhizotomy in all patients	- Root damage in all patients (n=12) - Incomplete deafferentation (n=2 and one more is suspected).			
Brindley et al, 1990 (n=48)	-	-	- 37.5% of patients reported implant failures --> 25 failures in total - Receiver block failure (n=7) - New implantation due to cable break (n=1) - Cable break (n=5) - Connector failures (n=12)	- 17% of users noted increased spasms - Backache (n=2) - Stimulus pain (n=1) and pain leading to stop implant use (n=2) - Increased sweating (n=6) - Occasional headache (n=1) - Occasional autonomic dysreflexia (n=1) - Loss of reflex erections (n=8) and Increased constipation (n=4)	-
Brindley, 1994 and Brindley, 1995 (n=479)	- Implantation: * 88.2 % intradural * 4.6% Extradural * 7.2% Unknown - Rhizotomy: * 73.6% Rhizotomy * 10.4% No rhizotomy * 16% Unknown	- Infection following surgery and device explantation (n=3)	- Implant failures in 72 of the 500 first patients * 56 repairs -> 21 second failures ▪ 9 replaced and 12 repaired -> 3 third failures ▪ 1 replaced ▪ 2 repaired * 9 replaced by a new stimulator with extradural electrodes -> 2 failures ▪ 2 repaired * 5 Implant needed no repair since implant-driven micturition remained good * 2 waiting to be repaired - Total number of failures = 98 * 18 receiver failures * 18 connector failures * 3 cable fractures * 42 cables outside their receiver blocks * 17 Unknown	- Infection and explantation during follow-up (n=1) - Exposition of the receiver block (n=5) - 95 surgery performed to remedy faults in implant: * 75 repair procedures (cables, receiver block) -> 2 infections * 20 implantations of a new device -> 1 infection and explantation - Death due to renal failure (n=1) - Deterioration of the upper urinary tract (n=11) -> Including one death from carcinomatosis, primary in the bladder - Second deafferentation (n=39) - Spinal roots deterioration during follow up (n=8) - Failures of implant driven micturition due to overstretching of bladder wall (n=5) -> recovery in all cases.	-