Anterior Cervical Fusion vs. Cervical Disc Replacement: An Expert Guide to Understanding Your Neck Surgery Options

Written and medically reviewed by Dr. Ronjon Paul, Orthopedic Spine Surgeon, Endeavor Health

"Each patient's spine is unique. The right surgery is the one that restores your confidence in movement — safely, predictably, and durably." — Dr. Ronjon Paul

Quick Summary

Procedures Compared	Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion (ACDF) vs. Cervical Disc Replacement (CDR / Arthroplasty)
Shared Goal	Relieve spinal cord and nerve compression, restore comfort and function
Key Difference	ACDF fuses two vertebrae into one solid unit; CDR replaces the damaged disc with a motion-preserving implant
Pain Relief	Both provide excellent arm pain and nerve relief in peer-reviewed studies
Motion	ACDF removes motion at that level (which is often already stiff); CDR preserves motion
Long-Term Trend	Both are durable; CDR shows fewer adjacent-level surgeries in many 10-year trials
Philosophy of Care	Dr. Paul and his team individualize every recommendation — preserving motion when safe, stabilizing when necessary

1. Shared Purpose: Relieve Pressure, Protect Function

Both surgeries remove pressure from the nerves or spinal cord — the true source of arm pain, numbness, and weakness — while restoring alignment and stability.

Dr. Paul's experience with both procedures allows him to identify which approach best matches your anatomy and lifestyle, use precise, minimally invasive techniques, and focus on outcomes that matter most — pain relief, stability, and confident motion.

2. Anterior Cervical Discectomy and Fusion (ACDF)

A small incision is made in the front of the neck. The damaged disc and bone spurs are removed, and a spacer (bone graft or cage) with a small plate and screws is placed so the bones fuse into one stable unit.

Patients experience excellent arm and neck pain relief and improved function once nerve symptoms are relieved.

ACDF remains the gold standard for advanced arthritis, deformity, or multi-level disease.

Learn more: https://paulspine.com/anterior-cervical-discectomy-and-fusion/

3. Cervical Disc Replacement (CDR / Arthroplasty)

Uses the same approach as ACDF but replaces the diseased disc with a mobile mechanical implant designed to preserve motion and protect nearby segments.

Patients often describe a more natural neck movement postoperatively. Ideal for younger, active patients with healthy facet joints.

Long-term data shows similar or better results than ACDF, with fewer adjacent-level surgeries.

Learn more: https://paulspine.com/anterior-cervical-disc-replacement/

4. How Do They Compare for Patients?

4.1 Pain Relief and Recovery

Both ACDF and CDR reliably relieve pain and improve function with similar recovery timelines.

4.2 Motion and How Your Neck Feels

CDR preserves motion at the operated level and feels more natural. ACDF removes motion at the fused level, but other segments compensate effectively.

4.3 Adjacent-Level Wear

ACDF slightly increases stress on adjacent discs, while CDR reduces reoperation rates for adjacent-level disease.

4.5 A Key Nuance About Motion: “You’re Often Already Stiff There”

By the time fusion is being considered, most patients already have severe loss of motion due to advanced spondylosis — collapsed discs, bone spurs, and thickened joints that barely move.

These levels contribute very little to overall neck flexibility before surgery. Once decompressed and stabilized, patients often feel freer and more comfortable even though one level is fused.

Supporting studies: Chang & Chang, Neurospine 2018; Limanówka et al. 2020; Liang et al., Front Bioeng Biotech 2022.

4.6 An Important Reality Check: CDR Has Implant-Specific Risks

While Cervical Disc Replacement is an excellent option, it carries unique risks such as implant migration, subsidence, heterotopic ossification, and complex revision requirements.

Though rare (3–5% revision rate), these complications can be serious, highlighting the importance of surgeon experience and long-term monitoring.

4.7 Why Artificial Discs Don't Fully Replicate the Complexity of Your Natural Cervical Disc

Cervical disc replacements are advanced but cannot perfectly recreate the biomechanical complexity of a natural disc. Artificial discs provide mobility, but not the full six degrees of freedom or shock absorption of a biological disc.

Modern devices replicate rotational motion but not the nuanced coupled translation and viscoelastic response of a natural disc. Patients should expect functional, but not identical, motion.

Supporting literature: DiAngelo DJ et al., Spine 2003; Rousseau MA et al., J Neurosurg Spine 2008; Puttlitz CM et al., J Neurosurg Spine 2004; Heller J et al., Spine J 2005; White & Panjabi, Clinical Biomechanics of the Spine 1990.

5. How Dr. Paul's Team Helps You Decide

Decisions are personalized and evidence-based. Dr. Paul's team evaluates imaging, bone quality, and lifestyle to choose between motion preservation or fusion for the best long-term outcome.

6. Real-World Takeaway

CDR is ideal for selected patients seeking motion preservation with comparable pain relief and faster recovery. ACDF remains the preferred choice for advanced degeneration or instability.

7. References (Selected Peer-Reviewed Sources)

1. 1. Nunley PD et al. Mobi-C Cervical Disc: 10-Year Outcomes. Spine J. 2023.
2. 2. Gornet MF et al. Prestige LP Cervical Disc 10-Year Data. Neurosurgery. 2022.
3. 3. Wang F et al. Meta-Analysis: CDR vs ACDF Long-Term Results. Eur Spine J. 2019.
4. 4. Chang SW et al. A Comparison of ACDF Versus TDR-C. Neurospine. 2018.
5. 5. Shamji MF et al. Complications and Reoperations After Cervical Arthroplasty. Neurosurgery. 2019.
6. 6. Chen YS et al. Subsidence and Reoperation After CDR. Spine J. 2021.
7. 7. Yi S et al. Heterotopic Ossification After CDR. J Neurosurg Spine. 2020.
8. 8. Gornet MF et al. Revision Cervical Disc Arthroplasty: Mechanisms and Outcomes. Spine. 2021.
9. 9. Limanówka B et al. Changes in Cervical ROM Following ACDF. 2020.
10. 10. Liang W et al. Biomechanical Adaptation After ACDF. Front Bioeng Biotech. 2022.
11. 11. DiAngelo DJ et al. Biomechanics of Cervical Total Disc Replacement Compared with Fusion. Spine. 2003.
12. 12. Rousseau MA et al. Influence of Prosthesis Design on Kinematics. J Neurosurg Spine. 2008.

13. 13. Puttlitz CM et al. Comparison of Artificial Disc Prostheses with the Natural Disc. J Neurosurg Spine. 2004.
14. 14. White AA III & Panjabi MM. Clinical Biomechanics of the Spine. 1990.