International Journal of Healthcare Sciences ISSN 2348-5728 (Online)
Vol. 4, Issue 2, pp: (681-686), Month: October 2016 - March 2017, Available at: www.researchpublish.com

Systematic review of Anterior Versus Posterior Simultaneous Bilateral Total Hip Arthroplasties

[1]Mohammed Hadi Abass Hakami, [2]Ismail Mohammed H Otayn,
[3]Alhumaid, Tariq Majed A

Abstract: **Total hip arthroplasty (THA) has been shown to be an affordable treatment for osteoarthritis of the hip and uses patient's relief of pain, improved function and significant enhancement in quality of life.** ***The propose of this review was to evaluate the two procedures for Total hip arthroplasty (THA) which are the anterior and posterior bilateral hip arthroplasties, by reviewing the advantage and disadvantage of each method, and demonstrate different outcomes of each procedure through based evidence human trails.*** **We conducted a literature search of Medline (PubMed), the Cochrane Library, and CINAHL. We used exploded MeSH terms and key words to generate sets for the following themes: Total Hip Arthroplasty and Surgical Approach. We then used the Boolean term "AND" to find their intersection. No limits were used, including no language limits. This basic approach was modified as necessary to search each electronic database. The posterior method stays a popular direct exposure for THA. The advantages of the posterior method include surgeon familiarity, excellent direct exposure of the thigh, and conservation of the gluteus medius and minimus. Nevertheless, a high incidence of posterior dislocation has been reported with this direct exposure by many authors. The increased incidence of dislocation has actually been credited to the division of the posterior hip pill and external rotators and acetabular component malposition. In some RCTs Patients in the direct anterior group attained some, however not all, functional turning points previously than the patients in the posterior group.**

Keywords: **Total hip arthroplasty, posterior bilateral hip arthroplasties.**

1. INTRODUCTION

Total hip arthroplasty (THA) has been shown to be an affordable treatment for osteoarthritis of the hip and uses patient's relief of pain, improved function and significant enhancement in quality of life [(1,2,3)]. Driven by the aging of the United States population, the need for THA is anticipated to grow tremendously in the next twenty years. Kurtz et al noted a 50% increase in the occurrence of THA from 1990 to 2002 [(4)] and projected a 174% boost, in THA from 208,600 in 2005 to 572,000 in 2030 [(5)]. There are numerous surgical methods that are utilized in primary THA. Presently, the posterior approach is the most common approach used in the United States [(6)]. Just recently, nevertheless, there has been increased interest in the anterior (Hueter) approach for THA in the orthopedic community and public due the belief that the intermuscular anterior method might lead to reduced pain, quicker recovery, enhanced hip stability and decreased risk of dislocation following surgical treatment when compared to the more typically utilized, musclesplitting, posterior approach. In addition, since the patient is placed supine on the operating room, the anterior approach allows the use of fluoroscopic image augmentation enabling intraoperative assessment and correction of element positioning which might allow more precise final element position. Preliminary series of patients who have undergone THA utilizing the anterior technique have suggested decreased narcotic usage, reduced length of medical facility stay, reduced 30- day readmission, higher percent discharged to house vs. rehab center, earlier independent mobilization and improved radiographic element positioning [(7,8,9,10)]. Others recommend that it is not the surgical method, however rather elements such as patient patient, family and choice education, sped up rehab and improved analgesia procedures that play a more essential role in influencing THA outcomes [(11,12,13)]. As of this time, we are uninformed of any released methodical evaluations comparing the effectiveness of the posterior versus anterior method to THA.

The Hueter anterior method to the hip has actually been utilized by Judet and Judet for hip joint exposure for arthroplasty strategies because 1947 [14,15]. The initial method included elimination of the anterior tensor fascia lata from the anterolateral iliac crest, sectioning the reflected head of the rectus, and release of the piriformis. Since the initial description, the technique has been customized to permit direct exposure of the acetabulum and femur through a single, anterior cut that does not need release of any muscles or tendons from the hips or femur [14,15].

The propose of this review was to evaluate the two procedures for Total hip arthroplasty (THA) which are the anterior and posterior bilateral hip arthroplasties, by reviewing the advantage and disadvantage of each method, and demonstrate different outcomes of each procedure through based evidence human trails.

2. METHODS

We have conducted a systematic review study and reported the findings in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews (PRISMA).

Searching method:

We conducted a literature search of Medline (PubMed), the Cochrane Library, and CINAHL. We used exploded MeSH terms and key words to generate sets for the following themes: Total Hip Arthroplasty and Surgical Approach. We then used the Boolean term "AND" to find their intersection. No limits were used, including no language limits. This basic approach was modified as necessary to search each electronic database. Additionally, we reviewed the reference lists of all included studies and contacted subject-matter experts in the field of THA. for complete search strategy and results. Two reviewers divided the results from our literature search and conducted an independent initial review for eligibility based on title and abstract. Studies that were clearly not related to our research question were immediately excluded.

3. RESULTS & DISCUSSION

2 studies compared pre-operative and post-operative serum markers of inflammation and muscle damage such as creatine kinase (CK), C-reactive protein (CRP), interleukin-6 (IL-6), interleukin-1 beta (IL-1β), growth necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-α) and myoglobin) [16,17]. Bergin et al [17] observed a considerable, 5.5 times greater, instant boost in creatine kinase (CK) levels in the posterior-approach group than in the anterior-approach group in the post anesthesia care system, indicate distinction: 150.3 U/L (95% CI 70.4 to 230.2), however there were no considerable differences at later time points or in other serum markers. Pilot et al [16] reported a comparable amount of muscle damage and inflammatory response in both groups. 3 studies compared postoperative narcotic usage. Barrett et al [18] found a considerable distinction in favor of the anterior method on post-operative day 1 but no difference on the day of surgery or on post-operative day 2. Schweppe et al [19] found a statistically substantial difference in favor of the anterior approach on post-operative days 0- 3 with regard to total narcotic usage. Rodriguez et al [20] found no significant difference between techniques. 4 studies [21,22,23,24] compared post-operative healing of gait based upon spatiotemporal gait analysis and discovered no significant distinction between approaches.

9 research studies supplied data on patient reported pain and function outcomes [18, 21,22,25,26,27,28,29,30]. Procedures and follow-up interval varied substantially. Barrett et al [18] reported different 6-week HHS subsets and 6-week total HHS (89.5 vs. 81.4, P = 0.0001) and 3-month HOOS signs scores (90.0 vs. 83.9, P = 0.0471) favored the anterior method. Similarly, Nakata et al [28] reported that the 2- month Merle d'Aubigne and Postel capability to walk ratings (5.0 vs. 4.3, P = 0.023) favored the anterior approach. Maffiuletti et al [21] reported a substantial difference in the WOMAC stiffness rating (0.0 vs. 12.5, P b 0.05) favoring the anterior approach, nevertheless the timeframe for the measurement was unclear. Zawadsky et al [30] reported a statistically significant distinction in 2-week VAS ratings (2.2 vs. 5.2, P b 0.001) favoring the anterior method. The staying 5 studies discovered no significant differences in results in between the two groups at any time points.

Outcome measure in most comparative studies:

Secondary result procedures included intra-operative, radiographic and post-operative comparisons, for more details of each result measure. we consisted of 10 studies and we evaluated the comparative outcomes steps among these tracks, we summarized them in (**TABLE1**).

We pre-specified the main result of interest as validated, patient reported outcome steps concentrating on pain and function following THA. Accepted Validated Patient Reported Outcome Measures consisted of: Harris Hip Score (HHS) [33], Medical Outcome Study (SF-12 (34) or SF-36 [35]), Visual Analog Pain Scale (VAS) [34], Hip Outcome Score (HOS)

(13), Western Ontario & McMasters University Arthritis Index (WOMAC) [18], Hip impairment and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (HOOS) (21), Merle d'Aubigne and Postel rating [23], UCLA Activity Scale [11].

TABLE1: Validated Patient Reported Outcome Measures.

Patient Reported Outcome Measure	Domains Covered	Total Score Range	Score Interpretation
Harris Hip Score (HHS) [9,10]	Pain, function, absence of deformity,	0–100	70–80 Fair
	range of motion		80–90 Good
			90–100 Excellent
Hip disability and Osteoarthritis	Pain, other symptoms, function in activities	0–100	Zero indicates extreme hip problems
Outcome Survey (HOOS) [9,11]	of daily living, function in sports and recreation,		100 indicates no hip problems
	hip-related quality of life		
Short-form Health Survey	Overall health status via Physical Component	0–100 PCS	50 is median score for United States
12 (SF-12) [12]	Status (PCS) and Mental Component Status (MCS)	0–100 MCS	population, standard deviation of 10
			PCS and MCS N50 is good
Short-form Health Survey	Overall health status via Physical Component	0–100 PCS	50 is median score for United States
36 (SF-36) [13]	Status (PCS) and Mental Component Status (MCS)	0–100 MCS	population, standard deviation of 10
			PCS and MCS N50 is good
Merle d'Aubigne and Postel score [31]	Pain, walking, range of motion	0-18	b13 Poor
			13–14 Fair
			15–17 Good
			18 Excellent
Oxford Hip Score (OHS) [9,32]	Pain, function in relation to daily activities	0–48	b27 Poor
			27-33 Fair
			34-41 Good
			N42 Excellent
Western Ontario and McMaster	Pain, stiffness, physical function	Pain 0–20	Higher scores indicate worse pain,
Universities Arthritis Index (WOMAC) [33]	in daily activities	Stiffness 0–8	stiffness, and function
		Function 0–68	
Japanese Orthopedic Association	Pain, range of motion, ability to walk,	0–84*	Higher scores indicate less pain,
Hip Score (JOAHS) [34,35]	activities of daily life		better ability to walk and perform
			activities of daily life

Comparative Studies according to the evidence level:

Zawadsky 2014 [30] carried out retrospective, successive associate research study compared THA for OA and ON in (50 direct anterior arthroplasty (DAA) after discovering curve/50 DAA throughout learning curve/50 Posterior arthroplasty (PA) on a basic operating room, without fluoroscopy with 6-week follow-up. For purposes of our evaluation we have utilized the 50 DAA cases after the knowing curve period for our contrast. It discovered that patients going through the anterior approach had actually substantially lowered LOS, higher likelihood of discharge to house, less use of assistive devices and narcotics and less pain. There was a higher rate of complications among patients in the DAA group however this applied to patients within the surgeon's 50-case knowing curve [30].

Martin 2013 [27] carried out retrospective accomplice study compared (41 anterior arthroplasty (AA) to 47 PA) going through THA for numerous signs with 6-month follow-up. It found that patients going through AA had shorter LOS and earlier mobility but longer operative time. There was no significant difference in issue rates, risk of transfusion, radiographic outcomes, or SF-36 or WOMAC scores. Intra-operative fluoroscopy was made use of in both the PA and AA. Of note, there was a substantial greater mean BMI in the PA and imply age in the AA group [27].

Rathod 2013 [22] single-surgeon conducted potential mate research study compared (11 DAA/11 PA) undergoing THA with 6-month and 12-month follow-up. It discovered no substantial difference in spatiotemporal gait criteria or HHS between groups. II Rodriguez 2014 This three-surgeon (1 DAA/2 PA) prospective accomplice study compared (60 DAA/60 PA) patients going through THA with one-year follow-up. It discovered that practical healing was quicker in patients with the DAA on the basis of TUG and M-FIM tests as much as 2 weeks, however no substantial differences were found with other metrics at any time points. II Ward 2008 This prospective friend study compared functional recuperate after 4 different approaches to THA (30 MIS-PA, 18 PA, 10 AA, 11 anterolateral). It discovered no benefit in healing of temporospatial gait attributes in any of the 4 groups at 6 weeks or 3 months [22].

4. CONCLUSION

The posterior method stays a popular direct exposure for THA. The advantages of the posterior method include surgeon familiarity, excellent direct exposure of the thigh, and conservation of the gluteus medius and minimus. Nevertheless, a high incidence of posterior dislocation has been reported with this direct exposure by many authors. The increased incidence of dislocation has actually been credited to the division of the posterior hip pill and external rotators and acetabular component malposition. In some RCTs Patients in the direct anterior group attained some, however not all, functional turning points previously than the patients in the posterior group; most of these distinctions had actually vanished by 2 weeks.

REFERENCES

[1] Chang RW, Pellisier JM, Hazen GB. A cost-effectiveness analysis of total hip arthroplasty for osteoarthritis of the hip. JAMA 1996;275(11):858.

[2] Lavernia CJ, Alcerro JC. Quality of life and cost-effectiveness 1 year after total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2011;26(5):705.

[3] Ethgen O, Bruyere O, Richy F, et al. Health-related quality of life in total hip and total knee arthroplasty. A qualitative and systematic review of the literature. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2004;86-A(5):963.

[4] Kurtz S, Mowat F, Ong K, et al. Prevalence of primary and revision total hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 1990 through 2002. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2005; 87(7):1487.

[5] Kurtz S, Ong K, Lau E, et al. Projections of primary and revision hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 2005 to 2030. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2007;89(4):780.

[6] Waddell J, Johnson K, Hein W, et al. Orthopaedic practice in total hip arthroplasty and total knee arthroplasty: results from the Global Orthopaedic Registry (GLORY). Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ) 2010;39(9 Suppl.):5.

[7] Kennon RE, Keggi JM, Wetmore RS, et al. Total hip arthroplasty through a minimally invasive anterior surgical approach. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2003;85-A(Suppl. 4):39.

[8] Matta JM, Shahrdar C, Ferguson T. Single-incision anterior approach for total hip arthroplasty on an orthopaedic table. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2005;441:115.

[9] Sariali E, Leonard P, Mamoudy P. Dislocation after total hip arthroplasty using Hueter anterior approach. J Arthroplasty 2008;23(2):266.

[10] Siguier T, Siguier M, Brumpt B. Mini-incision anterior approach does not increase dislocation rate: a study of 1037 total hip replacements. Clin Orthop Relat Res 2004(426):164.

[11] Daltroy LH, Morlino CI, Eaton HM, et al. Preoperative education for total hip and knee replacement patients. Arthritis Care Res 1998;11(6):469.

[12] Kim S, Losina E, Solomon DH, et al. Effectiveness of clinical pathways for total knee and total hip arthroplasty: literature review. J Arthroplasty 2003;18(1):69.

[13] Pour AE, Parvizi J, Sharkey PF, et al. Minimally invasive hip arthroplasty: what role does patient preconditioning play? J Bone Joint Surg Am 1920;89(9):2007.

[14] Judet J, Judet R: The use of an artificial femoral head for arthroplasty of the hip joint. J Bone Joint Surg 32B:166–173, 1950.

[15] Judet R, Judet J: Technique and results with the acrylic femoral head prosthesis. J Bone Joint Surg 34B:173–180, 1952.

[16] Pilot P, Kerens B, Draijer WF, et al. Is minimally invasive surgery less invasive in total hip replacement? A pilot study. Injury 2006;37(Suppl. 5):S17 [Erratum appears in Injury. 2007 Oct;38(10):1224].

[17] Bergin PF, Doppelt JD, Kephart CJ, et al. Comparison of minimally invasive direct anterior versus posterior total hip arthroplasty based on inflammation and muscle damage markers. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2011;93(15):1392.

[18] Barrett WP, Turner SE, Leopold JP. Prospective randomized study of direct anterior vs postero-lateral approach for total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2013;28(9):1634.

[19] Schweppe ML, Seyler TM, Plate JF, et al. Does surgical approach in total hip arthroplasty affect rehabilitation, discharge disposition, and readmission rate? Surg Technol Int 2013:XXIII.

[20] Rodriguez JA, Deshmukh AJ, Rathod PA, et al. Does the direct anterior approach in THA offer faster rehabilitation and comparable safety to the posterior approach? Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472(2):455.

[21] Maffiuletti NA, Impellizzeri FM, Widler K, et al. Spatiotemporal parameters of gait after total hip replacement: anterior versus posterior approach. Orthop Clin North Am 2009;40(3):407.

[22] Rathod PA, Orishimo KF, Kremenic IJ, et al. Similar improvement in gait parameters following direct anterior & posterior approach total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2014;29(6): 1261.

[23] Reininga IH, Stevens M, Wagenmakers R, et al. Comparison of gait in patients following a computer-navigated minimally invasive anterior approach and a conventional posterolateral approach for total hip arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. J Orthop Res 2013;31(2):288.

[24] Ward SR, Jones RE, Long WT, et al. Functional recovery of muscles after minimally invasive total hip arthroplasty. Instr Course Lect 2008;57:249.

[25] Rodriguez JA, Deshmukh AJ, Rathod PA, et al. Does the direct anterior approach in THA offer faster rehabilitation and comparable safety to the posterior approach? Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472(2):455.

[26] Spaans AJ, van den Hout JA, Bolder SB. High complication rate in the early experience of minimally invasive total hip arthroplasty by the direct anterior approach. Acta Orthop 2012;83(4):342.

[27] Martin CT, Pugely AJ, Gao Y, et al. A comparison of hospital length of stay and shortterm morbidity between the anterior and the posterior approaches to total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2013;28(5):849.

[28] Nakata K, Nishikawa M, Yamamoto K, et al. A clinical comparative study of the direct anterior with mini-posterior approach: two consecutive series. J Arthroplasty 2009; 24(5):698.

[29] Sugano N, Takao M, Sakai T, et al. Comparison of mini-incision total hip arthroplasty through an anterior approach and a posterior approach using navigation. Orthop Clin North Am 2009;40(3):365.

[30] Zawadsky MW, Paulus MC, Murray PJ, et al. Early outcome comparison between the direct anterior approach and the mini-incision posterior approach for primary total hip arthroplasty: 150 consecutive cases. J Arthroplasty 2014;29(6):1256.

[31] Higgins JPT, G Se. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 5.0.2. Available from The Cochrane Collaboration; 2009 [updated September 2009.

[32] Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. Ann Intern Med 2009;151(4):264.

[33] Harris WH. Traumatic arthritis of the hip after dislocation and acetabular fractures: treatment by mold arthroplasty. An end-result study using a new method of result evaluation. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1969;51(4):737.

[34] Jenkinson C, Layte R, Jenkinson D, et al. A shorter form health survey: can the SF-12 replicate results from the SF-36 in longitudinal studies? J Public Health Med 1997; 19(2):179.

[35] Ware Jr JE, Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. Med Care 1992;30(6):473.