

Editorial

Observations on the Present and the Future of Hip Surgery

Alberto Di Martino ^{1,2,3} 

¹ 1st Orthopedic Department, IRCCS Istituto Ortopedico Rizzoli, 40136 Bologna, Italy; albertocorrado.dimartino@ior.it

² Department of Biomedical and Neurimotor Sciences—DIBINEM, University of Bologna, 40136 Bologna, Italy

³ Sidney Kimmel Medical College at Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA 19107, USA

Each period in history has its own peculiar fashions and trends, and contemporary research on hip surgery is no exception. In the last 20 years, major efforts have been directed towards the study of the effects of implant modularity and tribology [1–3] and the use of big-headed implants on durability and the risk of failure [4]. However, it is now well known that while most of the choices made by hip surgeons and implant developers are associated with successful improvements, some of these have been connected to specific complications and implant failure that required revision surgery. Understanding the positive and also the negative evolution of orthopedic implants, and deepening the biological basis of implant osteointegration, have gradually improved the results of total hip arthroplasty (THA) surgery.

The present and the future of hip surgery include several different topics, mainly research on minimal invasiveness and enhanced recovery after surgery protocols, newer technologies to improve the outcome of hip replacements and, because of the increased number of primary implants, newer standardized approaches to revision THA surgery [5]. At present, hip reconstruction surgeons have the main aim of improving the postoperative recovery of THA patients, allowing them to return to full function and satisfactory daily living. Given the good outcomes of THA surgery, it was named “the surgery of the century” [6]. Hip surgeons promote the implementation of minimally invasive surgical approaches to the hip to minimize the trauma to the joint and soft tissues, and to allow early hospital discharge and return to daily activities [7]. Fast-track protocols require an unprecedented effort in terms of planning and preparation by doctors and all healthcare professionals. Dedicated anesthesiology protocols allow pain control and recovery, promoting early discharge [8]; patients can ambulate, use crutches and be discharged home in most cases on the same day as the surgery or the next day [9].

The implementation of minimally invasive surgery has allowed the support and extension of the indication of THA to younger patients for the first time, who require an early return to function and good aesthetic results [10], but it has also provided a unique opportunity to improve the quality of life in fragile elderly patients. In this sense, the direct anterior approach (DAA) has gained wide popularity in the last few years because of its intrinsic minimal operative trauma to the hip joint and because of the positive impact on implants’ survival, which is achieved independently from body habitus, age [10] and bony anatomy [11–13]. However, since the DAA has gained popularity, many surgeons have experienced its effectiveness in the management of hip diseases, either performing a mini-open preservative procedure for slipped capital femoral epiphysis [14] or performing neck reshaping for femoral–acetabular impingement [15]. Given the expertise developed by surgeons in this field, more complex anatomy and surgical cases are managed through the extended anterior approach, above all when the pathology affects the anterior aspect of the hip, as in the case of flexion contractures of the hips or calcifications in the context of the psoas muscle or anterior to the capsule [16,17].

As our ability to develop more sophisticated technologies has increased, substantial efforts have been directed towards the implementation of machines and software to support



Citation: Di Martino, A.

Observations on the Present and the Future of Hip Surgery. *J. Clin. Med.*

2023, 12, 3464. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm12103464>

Received: 23 April 2023

Accepted: 10 May 2023

Published: 14 May 2023



Copyright: © 2023 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

the skills of orthopedic surgeons [18]. A lot of current research is related to the implementation of newer technologies to improve patient-specific implant positioning accuracy, both preoperatively and intraoperatively. In the preoperative setting, correct templating is still required, and this can be performed through 2D imaging software and sometimes through 3D reconstruction [19]. Three-dimensional visualization is crucial in complex cases, and it is the base for the design of custom implants, nowadays used most in revision THA surgery [20].

Revision THA surgery is expected to grow in the near future because of the very high number of primary THA cases each year worldwide [21]. It is a kind of surgery that requires dedicated instrumentation and surgeon expertise, and an acceptance of the risk of failure and complications, which are classically increased in this patient population. An accurate knowledge of the causes and modes of failure of THA implants is required, and this may be enriched by the constant update of registries that monitor the survival of hip implants worldwide. Among the most common causes of failure, dislocation and aseptic and septic loosening are among the most frequently reported [22].

To improve the chance of the integration of implants through bone ingrowth at the bone–implant interface, newer biomaterials have been introduced into the market to promote the bone integration of the implant surface. Nowadays, tantalum and trabecular titanium are the technological bases for the design of modern implants used in revision cases. Modern technologies allow us to develop and produce personalized implants that are aimed at the filling of the bone defects occurring after the failure of THA implants or during implant removal [23].

While at present, computer-assisted surgery and navigation are the most promising methods for implant placement accuracy, proper patient study and preparation are quintessential. Artificial intelligence-based programs aimed at the production of personalized implants may, in the future, ease the surgery and bone stock reconstruction of patients [24].

As technology is changing our lifestyle and many aspects of human relationships, we are confident that in the future, scientific progress will be able to reduce human error and improve the durability of hip implants. However, despite these advancements, doctors should never forget both the human being behind the technology and the patient behind the radiography and implant.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Traina, F.; De Fine, M.; Di Martino, A.; Faldini, C. Fracture of Ceramic Bearing Surfaces Following Total Hip Replacement: A Systematic Review. *BioMed. Res. Int.* **2013**, *2013*, 157247. [[CrossRef](#)]
2. Castagnini, F.; Bordini, B.; Cosentino, M.; Ancarani, C.; Mariotti, F.; Biondi, F.; Faldini, C.; Traina, F. The Influence of Bearing Surfaces on Revisions Due to Dislocations in Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J. Mater. Sci. Mater. Med.* **2021**, *32*, 123. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
3. Wakabayashi, H.; Hasegawa, M.; Naito, Y.; Tone, S.; Sudo, A. Minimum 10-Year Results of Modular Metal-On-Metal Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 6505. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
4. Vendittoli, P.-A.; Martinov, S.; Morcos, M.W.; Sivaloganathan, S.; Blakeney, W.G. Personalized Hip Joint Replacement with Large Diameter Head: Current Concepts. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 1918. [[CrossRef](#)]
5. Thaler, M.; Dammerer, D.; Ban, M.; Leitner, H.; Khosravi, I.; Nogler, M. Femoral Revision Total Hip Arthroplasty Performed through the Interval of the Direct Anterior Approach. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 337. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
6. Learmonth, I.D.; Young, C.; Rorabeck, C. The Operation of the Century: Total Hip Replacement. *Lancet Lond. Engl.* **2007**, *370*, 1508–1519. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
7. Ohta, Y.; Sugama, R.; Minoda, Y.; Mizokawa, S.; Takahashi, S.; Ikebuchi, M.; Nakatsuchi, T.; Nakamura, H. Is the Anterolateral or Posterolateral Approach More Effective for Early Postoperative Recovery after Minimally Invasive Total Hip Arthroplasty? *J. Clin. Med.* **2023**, *12*, 139. [[CrossRef](#)]
8. Liu, J.; Chen, B.; Wu, X.; Wang, H.; Zuo, X.; Lei, Y.; Huang, W. Total Hip Arthroplasty Patients with Distinct Postoperative Fibrinolytic Phenotypes Require Different Antifibrinolytic Strategies. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 6897. [[CrossRef](#)]
9. Fast-Track Programs in Total Hip and Knee Replacement at Swedish Hospitals-Influence on 2-Year Risk of Revision and Mortality—PubMed. Available online: <https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih.gov.ezproxy.unibo.it/33919773/> (accessed on 11 April 2023).

10. Di Martino, A.; Brunello, M.; Rossomando, V.; Pederiva, D.; Schilardi, F.; Stefanini, N.; Geraci, G.; Faldini, C. Aesthetic Results, Functional Outcome and Radiographic Analysis in THA by Direct Anterior, Bikini and Postero-Lateral Approach: Is It Worth the Hassle? *J. Clin. Med.* **2023**, *12*, 1072. [[CrossRef](#)]
11. Faldini, C.; Brunello, M.; Pilla, F.; Geraci, G.; Stefanini, N.; Tassinari, L.; Di Martino, A. Femoral Head Autograft to Manage Acetabular Bone Loss Defects in THA for Crowe III Hips by DAA: Retrospective Study and Surgical Technique. *J. Clin. Med.* **2023**, *12*, 751. [[CrossRef](#)]
12. Young, E.; Regan, C.; Milbrandt, T.A.; Grigoriou, E.; Shaughnessy, W.J.; Stans, A.A.; Larson, A.N. Predictors of Total Hip Arthroplasty Following Pediatric Surgical Treatment of Developmental Hip Dysplasia at 20-Year Follow-Up. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 7198. [[CrossRef](#)]
13. Janz, V.; Hipfl, C.; Düppers, F.; Perka, C.F.; Wassilew, G.I. Developmental Hip Dysplasia Treated with Cementless Total Hip Arthroplasty Using a Straight Stem and a Threaded Cup—A Concise Follow-Up, At a Mean of Twenty-Three Years. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 1912. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
14. Faldini, C.; De Fine, M.; Di Martino, A.; Fabbri, D.; Borghi, R.; Pungetti, C.; Traina, F. Anterior Minimally Invasive Subcapital Osteotomy without Hip Dislocation for Slipped Capital Femoral Epiphysis. *Int. Orthop.* **2016**, *40*, 1615–1623. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
15. Cho, S.-H. Open Surgical Treatment for Femoroacetabular Impingement in Patients over Thirty Years: Two Years Follow-up Results. *Hip Pelvis* **2015**, *27*, 241–249. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
16. Day, C.W.; Costi, K.; Pannach, S.; Atkins, G.J.; Hofstaetter, J.G.; Callary, S.A.; Nelson, R.; Howie, D.W.; Solomon, L.B. Long-Term Outcomes of Staged Revision Surgery for Chronic Periprosthetic Joint Infection of Total Hip Arthroplasty. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *11*, 122. [[CrossRef](#)]
17. Hardt, S.; Leopold, V.J.; Khakzad, T.; Pumberger, M.; Perka, C.; Hipfl, C. Extended Trochanteric Osteotomy with Intermediate Resection Arthroplasty Is Safe for Use in Two-Stage Revision Total Hip Arthroplasty for Infection. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *11*, 36. [[CrossRef](#)]
18. Bullock, E.K.C.; Brown, M.J.; Clark, G.; Plant, J.G.A.; Blakeney, W.G. Robotics in Total Hip Arthroplasty: Current Concepts. *J. Clin. Med.* **2022**, *11*, 6674. [[CrossRef](#)]
19. Di Martino, A.; Rossomando, V.; Brunello, M.; D’Agostino, C.; Pederiva, D.; Frugieue, J.; Pilla, F.; Faldini, C. How to Perform Correct Templating in Total Hip Replacement. *Musculoskelet. Surg.* **2023**, *107*, 19–28. [[CrossRef](#)]
20. Wilson, A.S.; Cui, Q. Current Concepts in Management of Femoroacetabular Impingement. *World J. Orthop.* **2012**, *3*, 204–211. [[CrossRef](#)]
21. Singh, J.A.; Yu, S.; Chen, L.; Cleveland, J.D. Rates of Total Joint Replacement in the United States: Future Projections to 2020–2040 Using the National Inpatient Sample. *J. Rheumatol.* **2019**, *46*, 1134–1140. [[CrossRef](#)]
22. Simon, S.; Frank, B.J.H.; Aichmair, A.; Manolopoulos, P.P.; Dominkus, M.; Schernhammer, E.S.; Hofstaetter, J.G. Impact of the 1st and 2nd Wave of the COVID-19 Pandemic on Primary or Revision Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty—A Cross-Sectional Single Center Study. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 1260. [[CrossRef](#)]
23. Tibbo, M.E.; Limberg, A.K.; Perry, K.I.; Pagnano, M.W.; Stuart, M.J.; Hanssen, A.D.; Abdel, M.P. Effect of Coronal Alignment on 10-Year Survivorship of a Single Contemporary Total Knee Arthroplasty. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 142. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
24. van Drongelen, S.; Stetter, B.J.; Böhm, H.; Stief, F.; Stein, T.; Meurer, A. Identification of Patients with Similar Gait Compensating Strategies Due to Unilateral Hip Osteoarthritis and the Effect of Total Hip Replacement: A Secondary Analysis. *J. Clin. Med.* **2021**, *10*, 2167. [[CrossRef](#)] [[PubMed](#)]

Disclaimer/Publisher’s Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.