Safely transitioning to the direct anterior from posterior approach for total hip arthroplasty

Takahito Yuasa^{a,*}, Katsuhiko Maezawa^a, Hironobu Sato^a, Yuichiro Maruyama^a, Kazuo Kaneko^b

^a Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Juntendo University Urayasu Hospital, Japan

^b Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Juntendo University, Japan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Direct anterior approach
Posterior approach
Total hip arthroplasty
Learning curve
Complication

ABSTRACT

Purpose: We compare the complication rate in transition to direct anterior (DAA) from posterior approach (PA) for total hip arthroplasty (THA).

Methods: This is a retrospective cohort single-surgeon study of consecutive primary THAs over a transition period from PA to DAA.

Results: There were no significant differences in dislocation rate, femoral fracture, lateral femoral cutaneous nerve injury or success rate in cup inclination and anteversion angle between two groups.

Conclusion: We conclude that this single-surgeon study demonstrates the safely transitioning to DAA from PA in THA with no significant increase in complications in a selected patients.

1. Introduction

Total hip arthroplasty (THA) has long been considered one of the most successful surgical procedures due to the consistent ability to relieve pain and restore function, and quality of life. The surgical approaches commonly used in THA include the posterior, direct lateral, anterolateral and anterior. Recent nationwide data show that the most common surgical approaches in use in hip arthroplasty are posterior and lateral.¹

The direct anterior approach (DAA) has become an increasingly popular THA technique due in large part to the perceived improvements in early functional recovery, decreased visual analogue scale pain scores, decreased length of stay, increased rate of discharge to home, and decreased use of assistive devices.^{2,3} Another potential advantage of the DAA is the ease with which intraoperative fluoroscopy can be used, which may help with component positioning.

Comparative studies have demonstrated reduced pain and quicker functional recovery with the anterior approach than a Hardinge (lateral) approach, and reduced markers of muscle damage when compared to the posterior approach (PA).^{4–6} However, other reports have noted an increased complication rate during a surgeon's early experience with this new technique. Woolson et al. reported that 9% of major complications in their early experiences using the DAA following primary THAs performed by the senior surgeons who had performed standard PA since their residency.⁷ Hallert et al. also reported that 8.5% of major complications in their first 200 DAA THAs.⁸ Spaans et al.,⁹ reported that

the early complication rate was higher in DAA group and no learning effect was observed in this group regarding operating time or blood loss. A recent meta-analysis showed a risk of intra-operative fractures and lateral femoral cutaneous nerve impairment.¹⁰

We changed the main approach for primary THA from PA to the DAA in 2011. The author (TY) who had previously used the standard PA changed main approach to the DAA. As an increasing number of surgeons are adopting the DAA, questions should arise if this transition from traditional approaches to the DAA is safe for the patients and if this approach reliably reproduces implant positioning.

In the previous work of Homma et al., they reported the safety in early experience with a DAA using fluoroscopy guidance with manual leg control for primary THA.¹¹ The aim of this study was to analyze the learning curve of transition to DAA from PA in THA performed by the single surgeon.

2. Material and methods

Institutional review board approval was obtained before review of any records. We performed a retrospective analysis of prospectively collected data following primary THA unless there is a posterior acetabular defect that requires bone graft and plate fixation, and femoral deformity. All THAs were performed by a single surgeon (TY) using the direct anterior and posterior approaches, at a single center from February 2012 to July 2015. A total of 88 consecutive THAs were retrospectively reviewed. Exclusion criteria for DAA were: 1) previous

* Corresponding author at: Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Juntendo University Urayasu Hospital, 2-1-1 Tomioka, Urayasu-city, Chiba, 279-0021, Japan.
E-mail address: tyuasa@juntendo.ac.jp (T. Yuasa).

history of any osteotomy surgery; 2) CROWE grade III or IV DDH; 3) short neck due to Perthes deformity; and 4) severe hip contracture with $< 30^\circ$ of hip mobility in the sagittal plane. The single surgeon is a trained joint surgeon who used the posterior approach exclusively previously in his practice before the transition. Before the transition to the DAA, the surgeon consulted other surgeon with experience in the DAA and completed at least five cases.

2.1. Surgical technique

Modern uncemented cups and proximal coated stems were used: the Trident–Accolade system (Stryker Orthopaedics, Mahwah, NJ, USA) was implanted in all cases.

In the DAA-THA, the operation was performed using the distal part of the Smith-Petersen approach with the patient in the supine position on a standard surgical table, and only the affected leg was sterilized. A capsulotomy and femoral neck osteotomy was performed in the supine position by inter-muscular penetration of the tensor fasciae latae and Sartorius muscle. Sequential reaming and acetabular component implantation was conducted and verified under fluoroscopic guidance. The cup was set up, aiming for an inclination angle of 40° and an anteversion angle of 20° . Femoral preparation was undertaken with the leg extended, externally rotated, and adducted. A superior capsulotomy was performed to aid in femoral exposure. Femoral broaching and trials were performed with fluoroscopy assistance.

For the PA-THA a standard approach was used with the patient adopting a lateral position on a standard surgical table. The cup setup was adjusted with a trial handle, aiming for an inclination angle of 40° and an anteversion angle of 20° . After inserting the stem, leg-length difference was checked, and optimal stem positioning was checked intra-operatively using an X-ray and any necessary adjustments were then made. After confirming that they were not impinging, the articular capsule and piriformis muscle were sutured back together.

2.2. Perioperative and postoperative protocol

Regardless of approach, all patients were subjected to the same preoperative, perioperative, anesthetic, rehabilitation, and pain protocols, except for the requirement for hip precautions in the posterior group which do not apply to the anterior group.

2.3. Clinical outcome

As a subjective measurement, surgeon reported outcome measurement (Harris Hip Score; HHS)¹² was used.

2.4. Radiological evaluation

We evaluated Lauenstein and AP imaging in a recumbent position in both the PA group and the DAA group eight weeks after surgery. The Trident acetabular cup and the Accolade stem were evaluated for each approach. For the radiographic assessments, a straight line was drawn to both teardrops using the Lewinneck method and the cup inclination angle measured.¹³ The anteversion angle was measured using the Widmer method.¹⁴ Successful cup positioning was defined as an inclination of $40^\circ \pm 10^\circ$ and an anteversion of $20^\circ \pm 10^\circ$. Stem alignment was evaluated via the angle formed between the long axis of the prosthesis and the long axis of the femur.¹⁵ As previously described by Abe et al.¹⁶ the alignment of the stem in the coronal plane was defined as neutral, valgus ($\geq 3^\circ$ medial deviation), or varus ($\geq 3^\circ$ lateral deviation). Using an X-ray profile view, the stem alignment in the sagittal plane was defined as neutral, extension ($\geq 3^\circ$ anterior deviation), or flexion ($\geq 3^\circ$ posterior deviation). The measurement was performed in a blinded fashion by two surgeons (TY and KM).

We also recorded early post-operative complications including dislocation, deep vein thrombosis, deep infection, and re-operation for any

Table 1
Characteristics of the patients.

	DAA (SD)	PA (SD)	p-value
No. of hips	45	43	
Gender F/M	39/3	36/5	
Diagnosis OA/ANF	41/4	36/7	
Age at operation	63.1(13.1)	60.9(11.7)	0.376
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.9(3.70)	23.5(3.55)	0.573
ASA	2.02(0.42)	2.06(0.34)	0.701

OA; osteoarthritis, ANF; aseptic necrosis of femoral head.

reason, with an average follow-up of 34.1 months (range, 18–56 months).

2.5. Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of differences between the two groups was performed using GraphPad Prism 5 version 5.0. Chi-square test was used for qualitative variables, and Student's *t*-test was used for quantitative variables. Levels of significance reaching 95% or more were accepted.

3. Results

A total of consecutive 88 patients (45 anterior, 43 posterior) underwent a primary THA performed by a single surgeon from February 2012 to July 2015. The DAA and PA groups had no significant differences in patient demographics (Table 1). There were no significant differences between the DAA and PA group in operation time (105.5 vs 101.9, $p = 0.416$), estimated blood loss (303.5 vs 308.7, $p = 0.776$), length of stay (21.5 vs 23.5, $p = 0.185$) (Table 2). At the final follow-up, there was no significant difference between the two group in Harris Hip score (91.2 vs 90.8, $p = 0.415$) (Table 2).

Radiologically, the cup inclination angle was 2.8° higher in the DAA group (42.3 ± 4.8) than the PA group (45.1 ± 5.5) ($p = 0.021$). The anteversion angle was 5.9° higher in the DAA group (24.8 ± 6.5) than the PA group (18.9 ± 4.4) ($p < 0.0001$) (Table 3). There were 11 cases of anteversion $> 30^\circ$ in the DAA group, while there were 6 cases of inclination angle $> 50^\circ$ in the PA group. There was no significant difference of success rate in cup inclination angle and anteversion angle using the DAA (75.6%) versus the PA (86.0%) ($p = 0.213$). There was no difference in stem position on AP and lateral view between the DAA and the PA group, except for those stems implanted in valgus on AP view in the DAA group (Table 3).

Postoperative complications in the DAA and PA groups are listed in Table 4. There was one case of anterior dislocation in the DAA group and two cases of posterior dislocation in the PA group ($p = 0.498$). None of the patients with dislocation developed re-dislocation requiring revision surgery. Femoral chip fracture was observed in three cases in DAA group and one case in PA group ($p = 0.153$). In the DAA group, three cases of lateral femoral cutaneous nerve injury were observed ($p = 0.108$), but it was transient. Neither femoral shaft fracture nor stem subsidence were observed. At the final follow-up, no revision was necessary in both groups.

Table 2
Outcome by surgical approach.

	DAA (SD)	PA (SD)	p-value
Operation time (min)	105.5 (17.2)	101.9 (14.9)	0.416
Estimated blood loss (g)	303.5 (71.4)	308.7 (83.1)	0.776
Length of stay (days)	21.5 (4.15)	23.5 (5.76)	0.185
Harris Hip Score			
Pre-op	47.1 (8.03)	49.8 (5.41)	0.238
Final follow-up	91.2 (6.02)	90.8 (4.83)	0.415

Table 3
Radiographical analysis.

	DAA	PA	p-value
Cup angle (SD)			
Inclination	42.3 ± 4.8	45.1 ± 5.5	0.021
Anteversion	24.8 ± 6.5	18.9 ± 4.4	< 0.0001
Stem in AP view number of hips (%)			
Neutral	38 (84.4%)	33 (76.7%)	0.908
Varus	2 (4.4%)	0	0.162
Valgus	5 (11.1%)	10 (23.3%)	0.01
Stem in lateral view number of hips (%)			
Neutral	27 (60.0%)	30 (69.8%)	0.378
Extension	1 (2.2%)	0	0.326
Flexion	17 (37.8%)	13 (30.2%)	0.455

Table 4
Complications.

	DAA	PA	p-value
Dislocation	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.7%)	0.498
Femoral chip fracture	3 (6.6%)	1 (2.4%)	0.153
LFCN injury	3 (6.6%)	0	0.108
Infection	0	0	
Subsidence/thigh pain	0	0	
Revision	0	0	

LFCN injury; Lateral femoral cutaneous nerve injury.

4. Discussion

There are many different approaches for THA, all with advantage and disadvantage. According to the recent literature, DAA for THA has concerns about increased complications and operative time, especially during the learning curve period. Woolson et al.⁷ reported that the overall complication rate was 13% (31 of 247 hips), with 23 hips (9%) classified as having a major complication including 16 femoral shaft or trochanteric fractures, 2 deep infections requiring Girdlestone resection arthroplasties, 2 peroneal nerve injuries, and 3 immediate reoperations for leg length discrepancy. Spaans et al.⁹ compared DAA patients with matched cohort of PA patients, and reported a high rate of the early complication in DAA group, including 4 patients who required an intraoperative conversion from a DAA to a PA. Poehling-Monaghan et al.¹⁷ reported the DAA group had longer operative times than the PA group, while more wound problems occurred in the PA group. Malek et al.¹⁸ also reported that the rate of periprosthetic fractures was significantly higher in the DAA group even in experienced hands. In addition, a recent meta-analysis showed a risk of intra-operative fractures and lateral femoral cutaneous nerve impairment and the authors concluded that the DAA is a technically demanding procedure, with outcomes possibly indicative of surgeon learning curve.¹⁰

On the other hand, Schwartz et al.¹⁹ reported that there were no significant differences between the DA and PA group in 30-day readmission rates, 90-day readmission rates, complication rate, or revision rate. Recently, Cheng et al.²⁰ reported a prospective randomized clinical trial comparing early clinical results between the DAA and the PA in THA, and showed the adverse events, such as intraoperative fractures, were higher in the DAA group but no significant difference between the two groups. They also showed a high incidence (83%) of lateral cutaneous nerve of thigh neuropathia.

We have demonstrated in this single-surgeon study that the DAA can be transitioned to safely with no significant increase in complications or readmissions in first 45 cases. Furthermore, our results endorse the consistency of the DAA during this period in regard to component positioning when compared to PA. These results support the recent single-surgeon studies by Hamilton et al.²¹ and Rathrod et al.²² that show no

increased revision or dislocation rates in a DAA group compared to a PA during the learning curve of the first 100 DA patients. Although there were 3 greater trochanter fractures during the learning curve phase, the overall complication rate was not significantly higher in the DAA group and not consistent with the increase in overall complications found by some initial authors reporting on their series during the learning curve.^{7–9}

There are several limitations to this study. This is a single surgeon study and patients in this study were not randomized, and in fact, the patients in the DAA group were carefully selected. Despite this, the 2 groups had statistically similar demographics including age, sex, BMI, American Society of Anesthesiologist status, primary diagnosis.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that transition to the DAA does not lead to significantly worse complication rate and radiographic outcomes during the learning curve. The present study suggests experienced arthroplasty surgeons can learn and transition to the DAA safely with manual leg control, use of fluoroscopy in a selected patients.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical approval

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards. The study was approved by the medical research ethics committee at our university.

Informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual patients in this study.

References

- Chechik O, Khashan M, Lador R, Salai M, Amar E. Surgical approach and prosthesis fixation in hip arthroplasty world wide. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2013;133(11):1595–1600.
- Zawadzky MW, Paulus MC, Murray PJ, Johansen MA. 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):1256–1260.
- Barrett WP, Turner SE, Leopold JP. Prospective randomized study of direct anterior vs posterolateral approach for total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 2013;28(9):1634–1638.
- Restrepo C, Parvizi J, Pour AE, Hozack WJ. Prospective randomized study of two surgical approaches for total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 2010;25(5):671–679.
- Goebel S, Steinert AF, Schillinger J, et al. Reduced postoperative pain in total hip arthroplasty after minimal-invasive anterior approach. *Int Orthop.* 2013;36(3):491–498.
- 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):1392–1398.
- Woolson ST, Poullet MA, Huddleston JI. Primary total hip arthroplasty using an anterior approach and a fracture table: short-term results from a community hospital. *J Arthroplasty.* 2009;24(7):999–1005.
- Hallert O, Li Y, Brismar H, Brismar H, Lindgren U. The direct anterior approach: initial experience of a minimally invasive technique for total hip arthroplasty. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2012;25(7):17–22.
- Spaans AJ, 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):342–346.
- De Geest T, Fennema P, Lenaerts G, De Loore G. Adverse effects associated with the direct anterior approach for total hip arthroplasty: a Bayesian meta-analysis. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2015;135(8):1183–1192.
- Homma Y, Baba T, Kobayashi H, et al. Safety in early experience with a direct anterior approach using fluoroscopic guidance with manual leg control for primary total hip arthroplasty: a consecutive one hundred and twenty case series. *Int Orthop.* 2016;40(12):2487–2494.
- 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 J Surg Am.* 1969;51(4):737–755.
13. Lewinnek GE, Lewis JL, Tarr R, Compere CL, Zimmerman JR. Dislocations after total hip-replacement arthroplasties. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1978;60(2):217–220.
 14. Widmer KH. A simplified method to determine acetabular cup anteversion from plain radiographs. *J Arthroplasty.* 2004;19(3):387–390.
 15. Min BW, Song KS, Bae KC, Cho CH, Kang CH, Kim SY. The effect of stem alignment on results of total hip arthroplasty with a cementless tapered-wedge femoral component. *J Arthroplasty.* 2008;23(3):418–423.
 16. Abe H, Sakai T, Takao M, Nishii T, Nakamura N, Sugano N. Difference in stem alignment between the direct anterior approach and the posterolateral approach in total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 2015;30(10):1761–1766.
 17. Poehling-Monaghan KL, Kamath AF, Taunton MJ, Pagnano MW. Direct anterior versus miniposterior THA with the same advanced perioperative protocols: surprising early clinical results. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2015;473(2):623–631.
 18. Malek IA, Royce G, Bhatti SU, et al. A comparison between the direct anterior and posterior approaches for total hip arthroplasty: THE ROLE OF AN ‘ENHANCED RECOVERY’ PATHWAY. *Bone Joint J.* 2016;98-B(6):754–760.
 19. Schwartz BE, Sisko ZW, Mayekar EM, Wang OJ, Gordon AC. Transitioning to the direct anterior approach in total hip arthroplasty: is it safe in the current health care climate? *J Arthroplasty.* 2016;31(12):2819–2824.
 20. Cheng TE, Wallis JA, Taylor NF, et al. A prospective randomized clinical trial in total hip arthroplasty-comparing early results between the direct anterior approach and the posterior approach. *J Arthroplasty.* 2017;32(3):883–890.
 21. Hamilton WG, Parks NL, Huynh C. Comparison of cup alignment, jump distance, and complications in consecutive series of anterior approach and posterior approach total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* 2015;30(11):1959–1962.
 22. Rathod PA, Bhalla S, Deshmukh AJ, Rodriguez JA. Does fluoroscopy with anterior hip arthroplasty decrease acetabular cup variability compared with a nonguided posterior approach? *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2014;472(6):1877–1885.