Clinical Monograph

arthrosurface[®]

Comparison of Primary Stemless vs. Stemmed Shoulder Arthroplasty

Results from the 2014 Australian Shoulder Arthroplasty Registry

Matthias R. Schürhoff, MD

Introduction:

Stemmed shoulder replacement has been the standard of care in modern shoulder arthroplasty. Ample reports indicate that total shoulder replacement provides better pain relief and functional outcomes when compared to stemmed hemi arthroplasty (1-9). However, longer life expectancy, early joint deterioration in younger patients and increased functional demands on the implants cautions against the use of stemmed arthroplasty as a primary indication. When combined with the invasiveness of the procedure, poor bone preservation, and the technical challenges of restoring joint height, version, angle and volume, the argument against stemmed arthroplasty, especially in patients under 65 years old becomes quite evident.

In the 2014 Australian Joint Registry Report (10), Stemless Inlay Resurfacing (HemiCAP[®], Arthrosurface, Franklin, MA) demonstrated the lowest revision rate among all shoulder implant classes: 0.5 revisions per 100 observed implant years. Of particular interest is the treatment of patients under the age of 65 years where joint preservation is especially important. In this younger age demographic treated with primary arthroplasty for OA, Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement (TSR), Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement, and Hemi Onlay Resurfacing all showed a 5 - 6 times higher revision rate than HemiCAP Inlay Resurfacing (Figure 1-4). Reverse Total Shoulder Arthroplasty showed revision rates that were 2 - 4 times higher than HemiCAP.

The trend for an increasing revision rate in younger patients also becomes evident, when analyzing age group differences within each arthroplasty class: Stemmed TSR in patients over 75 yrs reported a revision rate of 1.70.

The rate increased by 46% when compared to patients under the age of 65 years (RR 2.48; RR> 55 years: 2.95) and 74% for patients under the age of 55 years.

Primary Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement for OA (age >75 years) reported a revision rate of 1.75 and the rate increased by 50% when compared to patients under the age of 65 years and to 103% in patients under the age of 55 years (RR 2.63; RR >55 years: 3.29).

Primary Hemi Onlay Resurfacing for OA (age >75 years) reported a revision rate of 1.49. The rate increased 108% when compared to patients under the age of 65 years and 90% respectively for patients under the age of 55 years (RR 3.10; RR > 55 years: 2.82).

Traditional shoulder replacement procedures have shown a substantial increase in revision rates when used in younger patients. Combined withthe technical advantages of stemless inlay resurfacing including the anatomic placement and bone preservation, the HemiCAP[®] implant proves to be an excellent choice as a new primary arthroplasty solution in the shoulder, particularly for younger patients under the age of 65 years.

Nomenclature:

Monograph	Registry	Implant Example
Stemless Inlay Resurfacing	Primary Partial Resurfacing Shoulder Replacement	HemiCAP
Hemi Onlay Resurfacing	Hemi Resurfacing Shoulder Replacement	Copeland etc.
Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement	Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement	Stemmed Global Advantage etc.
Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement	Total Conventional Shoulder Replacement	Bigliani/Flatow etc.

Revision Rate Comparison: Stemless Inlay HemiCAP[®] vs. Conventional Shoulder Arthroplasty Implants by Age



Revision Rate (RR)

The Australian Joint Registry Revision Rate is based on 100 observed implant years (Example: 100 patients with 1 year follow-up, or 10 patients with 10 years follow-up).



Stemless HemiCAP®

HemiCAP[®] Stemless Inlay Resurfacing All Ages

- Hemi Onlay Resurfacing <**65 yrs**
- Hemi Onlay Resurfacing 65-74 yrs
- Hemi Onlay Resurfacing >75 yrs
- Stemmed Hemi Arthroplasty <65 yrs
- Stemmed Hemi Arthroplasty 65-74 yrs
- Stemmed Hemi Arthroplasty >75 yrs
- Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement **<65 yrs**
- Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement 65-74 yrs
- Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement >75 yrs
- Reverse Total Shoulder Replacement All ages

Revision Rate/100 Observed Implant Years

HemiCAP

Clinical Monograph

4 3.1 2.75 2.4 2.26 1 0.5 0 Revision Rate/100 Observed Implant Years

Revision Rate Comparison: Stemless Inlay HemiCAP® vs. Hemi Onlay Resurfacing



- All Hemi Onlay Resurfacing All Ages
- All Hemi Onlay Resurfacing <65 yrs
- Aequalis / Tornier All Ages
- Copeland / Biomet All Ages
- Global CAP / Depuy All Ages
- SMR / Lima All Ages

Revision Rate Comparison: Stemless Inlay HemiCAP® vs. Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Arthroplasty



- HemiCAP[®] Stemless Inlay Resurfacing All Ages
- All Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement All Ages
- All Stemmed Hemi Shoulder Replacement <65 yrs
- SMR / Lima All Ages
- Global Advantage Fx / Depuy All Ages
- Global Advantage / Depuy All Ages
- Aequalis / Tornier All Ages
- Bigliani/Flatow / Zimmer All Ages

Revision Rate Comparison: Stemless Inlay HemiCAP® vs. Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement



HemiCAP[®] Stemless Inlay Resurfacing All Ages

- All Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement All Ages
- All Stemmed Total Shoulder Replacement <65 yrs
- SMR / Lima All Ages
- Aequalis / Tornier All Ages
- Global AP / Depuy All Ages
- Global Advantage / Depuy All Ages
- Bigliani/Flatow / Zimmer All Ages

References:

- Bell SN, Gschwend N. Clinical experience with total shoulder and hemiarthroplasty of the shoulder using the Neer Prosthesis. Inr Orthop 1986;10:217222.
- Bryant D, Litchfield RB, Sandow M, Gartsman GM, Guyatt G, Kirkley A. A comparison of pain, strength, range of motion, and functional outcomes after hemiarthroplasty and total shoulder arthroplasty in patient with osteoarthritis of the shoulder. J Bone Joint Surg 2005; 87A: 1947-1956.
- 3. Edwards TD, Kadakia NR, Boulahia A, Kempf J-F, Boileu P. Nemoz C, Walch G. A comparison of hemiarthroplasty and total shoulder arthroplasty in the treatment of primary glenohumeral osteo arthritis. Results of a multicenter study. J Shoulder Elbow Surg 2003;12:207-213.
- 4. Gartsman GM, Roddey TS, Hammerman SM, Shoulder arthroplasty with or without resurfacing of the glenoid in patients who have osteoarthritis, J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2000:82:26-34,
- Maier MW, Niklasch M, Dreher T, Wolf SI, Zeifang F, Loew M, Kasten P. Proprioception 3 years after shoulder arthroplasty in 3D motion analysis: a prospective study. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2012 Jul;132(7):1003-1010.
- Pfhlar M, Neyton JL, Sirveau F, Mole D. Hemiarthroplasty versus total shoulder prosthesis: result of cemented glenoid components. J Shoulder Elbow Surg 2006;15:154-163.
 Radney CS, Setter KJ, Chambers L, Levine WN, Bigliani LU, Ahmad CS. Total shoulder replacement compared with humeral head replacement for the treatment of primary glenohumeral osteoarthritis: a systematic review. J Shoulder Elbow Surg 2007;16:396-402.
- Singh JA, Sperling J, Buchbinder R, McMaken K. Surgery for osteoarthritis: a Cochrane Systematic Review. J Rheumatol 2011;38:598-605.
- Specing JW, Colfield RH, Schleck CD, Hamsen S. Total shoulder arthroplasty versus hemiarthroplasty for rheumatoid arthritis of the shoulder: Results of 303 consecutive cases. J Shoulder Elbow Surg 2007;16:683-690.
- 10. 2014 Australian Shoulder Arthroplasty Registry. Demographics and Outcomes of Shoulder Arthroplasty. https://aoanjrr.dmac.adelaide.edu.au/documents/10180/172288/Demographics%20 and%20Outcomes%20of%20Shoulder%20Arthroplasty

For additional product information, including indications, contraindications, warnings, precautions and potential adverse effects, please visit www.arthrosurface.com. The HemiCAP® family of devices is cleared by FDA and via international CE Mark

28 Forge Parkway • Franklin, MA 02038 • 1 508 520 3003 • fax: 1 508 528 3785 • www.arthrosurface.com