The Journal of Arthroplasty Vol. 26 No. 6 Suppl. 1 2011

The Effect of Total Hip Arthroplasty Surgical Approach on Postoperative Gait Mechanics

Robin M. Queen, PhD,*† Robert J. Butler, PT, PhD,†‡ Tyler S. Watters, MD,* Scott S. Kelley, MD,* David E. Attarian, MD,* and Michael P. Bolognesi, MD*

Abstract: Surgical approach for total hip arthroplasty (THA) is determined by clinician preference from limited prospective data. This study aimed to examine the effect of surgical approach (direct lateral, posterior, and anterolateral) on 6-week postoperative gait mechanics. Thirty-five patients (direct lateral, 8; posterior, 12; anterolateral, 15) were tested preoperatively and 6 weeks after THA. Patients underwent a gait analysis at a self-selected walking speed. A 2-way analysis of variance was used for analysis. Stride length, step length, peak hip extension, and walking speed increased after THA. The 3 surgical approach variables were not significantly different for any of the study variables after THA. All patients showed some increase in selected variables after THA regardless of surgical approach. In this study, surgical approach did not appear to significantly influence the early postoperative gait mechanics that were quantified. **Keywords:** gait analysis, total hip arthroplasty, surgical approach.

An estimated 2.5% of the population older than 40 years receives a total hip arthroplasty (THA) typically as a result of trauma or degenerative joint disease [1]. Patients usually present with reduced pain, improved function, and improved gait after THA surgery. Some common adverse effects and complications after THA include hip dislocation, hip musculature weakness, a Trendelenburg gait pattern, and the presence of a limp during gait [2-6]. It is hypothesized that some of these complications may be associated with the different types of surgical approaches used for THA.

A number of studies have assessed gait changes in patients after a THA [7-18]. Typically, after a THA, patients exhibit increased range of motion and improved symmetry of joint motion during gait, whereas changes in gait temporospatial parameters are less consistent [14,17,18]. Cross-sectional studies after the THA surgery have suggested that a posterior (P) surgical approach is most successful in improving hip joint symmetry in comparison with an anterior and anterolateral (AL) approach; however, the differences in these studies could be attributed to presurgical differences [8,11,19,20]. Studies examining the longitudinal effect of the different surgical approaches for THA on gait mechanics have reported minimal differences between techniques in restoring symmetry in ground reaction forces (GRFs), temporospatial parameters, or hip torques when factoring in presurgical values [10,12,13]. However, little evidence exists reporting the changes that occur locally at the hip joint during gait when individuals are recovering from different THA surgical approaches.

In summary, a number of studies have examined changes in gait after THA; however, there are limited prospective comparisons of hip mechanics during gait between different types of surgical approaches for THA. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine changes in gait mechanics between 3 common surgical approaches to the hip (AL, direct lateral [DL], and P) for THA. The changes in gait between the time before surgery and 6 weeks after the surgery were examined. It was expected that all subjects would demonstrate a significant improvement in gait from the preoperative time point to the 6-week postoperative time point and that no significant differences would exist between the surgical approaches.

*From the *Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; †Michael W. Krzyzewski Human Performance Lab, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina; and ‡Department Community and Family Medicine, Division of Physical Therapy, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina.*

Submitted July 12, 2010; accepted April 21, 2011.

The Conflict of Interest statement associated with this article can be found at doi:10.1016/j.arth.2011.04.033.

Investigation performed at Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC.

Reprint requests: Robin M. Queen, PhD, Duke Department of Orthopaedic Surgery. Director: Michael W. Krzyzewski Human Performance Lab, 102 Finch Yeager Building, DUMC 3435, Durham, NC 27710.

0883-5403/2606-0013$36.00/0
doi:10.1016/j.arth.2011.04.033

Materials and Methods

A total of 35 subjects (8 DL, 12 P, and 15 AL) participated in this study. The surgical approach groups had equal numbers of men and women, except for the AL approach group in which there were 7 men and 8 women. To participate, all subjects needed to be older than 35 years and be scheduled to have a THA within the next month. Patients with contralateral hip pain, diagnosis of contralateral joint degeneration, previous total joint arthroplasty in the lower extremity, or any history of neurologic disorders were excluded from this study. Subjects were recruited from three orthopedic clinics at the university, and consecutive patients who met the inclusion criteria and were willing to consent were enrolled for testing. Each subject read and signed an informed consent that had been approved by the medical center's institutional review board. After completion of the consent form, subjects were asked to change into form-fitting shorts for the remainder of testing.

The 3 surgical approaches that were examined were the DL or modified Hardinge, the standard P, and the AL or modified Watson-Jones approach.

In the DL group, the anterior one third of the gluteus medius from the origin of the vastus lateralis going proximally was detached and retracted anteriorly. The anterior one third to one half of the gluteus minimus was then split in line with the femoral neck, and a capsular window was excised. The anterior inferior hip ligaments were released to allow anterior hip dislocation. After implants were placed, each layer (gluteus minimus, gluteus medius, and fascia) was repaired anatomically with multiple nonabsorbable sutures. In the P group, the short external rotators and capsule were taken down directly off the posterior aspect of the femur. The extent of muscle release distally in this study group included partial release of the quadratus in some cases but no release of the gluteal sling. The inferior capsule was in most cases released to allow for idealized exposure for acetabular preparation. In the AL group, an incision was made through the skin on the line from the anterior superior iliac spine to the trochanter after which the interval between the anterior portion of the gluteus musculature and the tensor fascia was developed. After anterior capsulotomy, the acetabulum was prepared with hip abducted and externally rotated. The femur was prepared with the leg in extension and external rotation [21].

For the walking tests, subjects were asked to walk barefoot to avoid changes in the GRFs because of footwear. Reflective markers were then placed by a single tester at 39 anatomical landmarks [22,23]: sacrum (L5-S1), bilaterally on the acromioclavicular joint, lateral epicondyle, midpoint between the radial and ulnar styloids, anterior superior iliac spine, posterior superior iliac spine, greater trochanter, iliac crest, thigh, lateral knee (femoral condyle), shank, lateral malleolus, posterior superior heel, the second webspace (toes) in line vertically with the superior heel marker, posterior inferior heel, lateral heel, medial malleolus, medial femoral condyle, first metatarsal head, and fifth metatarsal head (Fig. 1). Subjects were then asked to stand within the capture volume in the anatomical position to record a static standing trial. The markers were recorded using an 8 camera real-time motion capture system (Motion Analysis Inc, Santa Rosa, Calif) sampling at 120 Hz. After the standing trial, the medial malleolus and medial femoral condyle, iliac crest, first metatarsal and fifth metatarsal markers were removed. Subjects were asked to walk at a self-selected comfortable walking speed during each of the walking trials. The dynamic assessment consisted of 7 walking trials along a 40-m walkway. Ground reaction force data were collected using 4 AMTI force plates that were embedded in the walkway (AMTI Inc, Watertown, Mass), sampling at 1200 Hz. This same procedure was repeated 6 weeks after THA.

Height, weight, age, Harris Hip Score, and surgical approach were recorded for each patient. The following study variables were analyzed to determine if any significant differences existed between the surgical approach groups or between the preoperative and 6-week postoperative time points: stance time, step length, stride length, step time, swing time, walking speed, peak vertical GRF, peak hip flexion angle, peak hip extension angle, hip flexion/extension angle at heel strike, peak hip abduction (ABD) angle and hip ABD/adduction (ADD) angle at heel strike. Step length is the distance between the heel of one foot and the heel of the contralateral foot during the double-support phase of gait. Stride length is the distance between the heel strike of one foot and the next heel strike of the same foot. Both step length and stride length were normalized to the subject's standing height. The temporal parameters that were obtained were stance time, step time, and swing time. Stance time is the time from heel strike on one foot to toe off of the same foot. Step time is the time from heel of one foot and the heel of the contralateral foot during the double support phase of gait. Finally, swing time is the time that elapses when the foot is not on the ground, from toe off of one foot to heel strike of the same foot. Each of these variables was normalized as a percentage of the gait cycle. The GRF data were normalized to each subject's body weight.

To better understand the potential differences in pain between the 3 surgical approach groups, a 1 × 3 analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the Harris Hip scores 6 weeks after the THA procedures. In addition, a 2 × 3 (time × approach) ANOVA was used for analysis of the gait variables. *Time* was defined as the preoperative or 6-week postoperative time point, whereas *approach* was defined as the DL, P, or AL surgical approach for the THA procedure. A separate