Improved functional outcomes with robotic compared with manual total hip arthroplasty

Brandon R. Bukowski, BSc¹, Paul Anderson, MD¹, Anton Khlopas, MD², Morad Chugthai, MD², Michael Mont, MD², Richard Illgen, MD¹ 1. Department of orthopedics and rehabilitation The university of wisconsin school of medicine and public health Madison, Wisconsin 2. Department of orthopaedic surgery Cleveland clinic, Cleveland, Ohio

Publication

Surg Technol Int. 2016 Oct

Introduction

Functional outcome following total hip arthroplasty (THA) is affected by accurate component positioning and restoration of hip biomechanics. Robotic-assisted THA (rTHA) has been shown to improve accuracy of component positioning, but its impact on functional outcomes has not been demonstrated. The purpose of this study was to compare: 1) operative time; 2) estimated blood loss; 3) postoperative complications; and 4) patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) between patients who either underwent rTHA or manual THA (mTHA).

Materials and methods

In this retrospective cohort study, a single-center database was used to identify all patients who underwent primary THA since introduction of rTHA at a large academic medical center. Surgical factors including operative time and estimated blood loss as well as postoperative complications were recorded. Validated PROMs following rTHA (n = 100) were compared with consecutive mTHA cases (n = 100) performed by the same fellowship-trained surgeon at a minimum one-year follow-up (24 ± 6 months). PROMs included the Short-Form 12 Health Survey (SF-12), UCLA activity score (UCLA), Western Ontario and McMaster (WOMAC) Osteoarthritis Index, and modified Harris Hip Score (mHHS). A categorical analysis was performed to determine differences in proportions of patients with mHHS scores of 90 to 100, 80 to 89, 70 to 79, and < 70 points between the two groups. Chi-square and two-tailed t-tests were used to compare categorical and continuous data between cohorts.

Table 1. Patient-reported outcomes (PROMs) comparing rTHA and mTHA patient groups

	Group (rTHA n=100, mTHA n=100)	Preoperative	Postoperative	PROMs (Postoperative – Preoperative)	p-value
mHHS (Mean and Standard Deviation)	rTHA	49.6 (16.3)	92.1 (10.5)	43.0 (18.8)	< 0.001
	mTHA	49.2 (14.8)	86.1 (16.2)	37.4 (18.3)	< 0.001
	p-value	0.865	0.002	0.035	
SF12-MCS (Mean and Standard Deviation)	rTHA	54.1 (10.4)	54.6 (9.1)	0.4 (9.7)	0.629
	mTHA	53.1 (9.6)	53.0 (10.2)	0.5 (11.5)	0.970
	p-value	0.459	0.245	0.962	
SF12-PCS (Mean and Standard Deviation)	rTHA	33.5 (9.6)	46.0 (10.5)	12.5 (11.8)	< 0.001
	mTHA	30.3 (8.0)	44.4 (11.0)	14.0 (11.9)	< 0.001
	p-value	0.010	0.282	0.404	
WOMAC (Mean and Standard Deviation)	rTHA	45.6 (18.9)	16.0 (14.9)	-29.6 (21.4)	< 0.001
	mTHA	47.1 (14.7)	17.3 (15.5)	-28.5 (18.3)	< 0.001
	p-value	0.536	0.538	0.618	
UCLA (Mean and Standard Deviation)	rTHA	5.1 (1.9)	6.3 (1.8)	1.2 (1.7)	< 0.001
	mTHA	4.8 (1.8)	5.8 (1.7)	1.0 (1.9)	< 0.001
	p-value	0.227	0.033	0.429	
	Categorical	Analysis of Mod	ified Harris Hip S	core	
90-100	75.0% (75)		61.0% (61)		0.034
80-89	13.0% (13)		15.0% (15)		0.684
70-79	6.0% (6)		5.0 % (5)		0.756
< 70	6.0% (6)		19.0% (19)		0.005

Reference:

A surgeon must always rely on his or her own professional clinical judgment when deciding whether to use a particular product when treating a particular patient. Stryker does not dispense medical advice and recommends that surgeons be trained in the use o

Products may not be available in all markets because product availability is subject to the regulatory and/or medical practices in individual markets. Please contact your sales representative if you have questions about the availability of products in your area

Stryker Corporation or its divisions or other corporate affiliated entities own, use or have applied for the following trademarks or service marks: Stryker. All other trademarks are trademarks of their respective owners or holders.

This poster is not sponsored by or affiliated with the AAHKS. MKOTHA-POS-10 18963 © 2018 Stryker

sti

Results

Mean operative time was nine minutes longer for the rTHA group compared with the mTHA group $(131 \pm 23 \text{ min vs. } 122 \pm 29 \text{ min}$, respectively, p = 0.012). Estimated intraoperative blood loss was reduced for the rTHA group when compared to the mTHA group $(374 \pm 133 \text{ mL vs. } 423 \pm 186 \text{ mL}, p = 0.035)$, and there was no difference in overall complication rates between the two groups (p = 0.101). Robotic-assisted THA demonstrated higher mean postoperative mHHS ($92.1 \pm 10.5 \text{ vs. } 86.1 \pm 16.2, p = 0.002$) and mean UCLA scores ($6.3 \pm 1.8 \text{ vs. } 5.8 \pm 1.7, p = 0.033$) compared with mTHA. The difference between pre- and postoperative mHHS scores was statistically significant when comparing rTHA with mTHA ($43.0 \pm 18.8 \text{ vs. } 37.4 \pm 18.3, p = 0.035$). There were no significant differences in SF-12 or WOMAC scores. There was a significantly higher proportion of patients with mHHS scores between 90 to 100 points (75% vs. 61%, p = 0.034) and a lower percentage with scores < 70 points (6% vs. 19%, p = 0.005) in the rTHA cohort compared with the mTHA cohort.

Discussion

The rTHA cohort demonstrated significantly higher mean postoperative UCLA scores, higher mean postoperative mHHS scores, and a greater percentage of patients with mHHS of 90 to 100 points compared with mTHA at a minimum one-year follow-up. To the author's knowledge, this is the first study to demonstrate that robotic-assisted THA leads to improved patient-reported outcomes. The observed improvement in functional outcomes following rTHA is encouraging and warrants additional multi-center studies to determine if these advantages are maintained at longer follow-up intervals.



Bukowski B.R, Chughtai M, Anderson P. et al. Improved functional outcomes with robotic compared with manual total hip arthroplasty. Surg Technol Int. 2016 Oct.

any particular product before using it in surgery.

The information presented is intended to demonstrate the breadth of Stryker's product offerings. A surgeon must always refer to the package insert, product label and/or instructions for use before using any of Stryker's products. The products depicted are CE marked according to the Medical Device Directive 93/42/EEC.