International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication
ISSN: 2321-8169 Volume: 11 Issue: 9
***Article Received:** 25 July 2023 **Revised:** 12 September 2023 **Accepted:** 30 September 2023*

Advancements in Joint Replacement Surgery: Improving Long-Term Outcomes and Patient Satisfaction

Dr. K.L. Gaonkar
Professor Department of Orthopaedics Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences,Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Karad, Maharashtra, India Email :klgaonkar@gmail.com

Dr. Nitin S. Patil,
Professor Department of Orthopaedics Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences,Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Karad, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Vikas Satre
Associate Professor Department of Orthopaedics Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences,Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Karad, Maharashtra, India

Dr. Sanjay Thorat,
Department of Medicine,Krishna Institute of Medical Sciences, Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Karad, Maharashtra

Mr. Mahendra M. Alate
Department of Research Krishna Vishwa Vidyapeeth, Karad,Maharashtra, India

Abstract
Orthopaedic procedures have changed dramatically in the last several years due to the spectacular developments in joint replacement surgery. The purpose of this review article is to clarify the various developments in joint replacement surgery with an emphasis on improving patient satisfaction and long-term results. The study looks at five important topics: patient selection, prosthetic materials, surgical techniques, technological advancements, and long-term outcomes.

Precision and implant longevity have been transformed by technological advancements such as 3D printing, robotic-assisted surgery, and computer-assisted navigation. Modern surgical methods have a strong emphasis on tissue preservation, less invasive procedures, and improved recovery protocols, which greatly lower postoperative problems and speed up recovery. Prosthetic material advancements including highly cross-linked polyethylene and customised designs have enhanced patient-specific results and implant longevity. In order to maximise surgical success and satisfaction, patient selection criteria, customised care regimens, and psychological support have become essential. When long-term results are assessed, functional abilities, implant durability, and patient satisfaction all show notable improvements; nonetheless, problems with complications and revision operations still exist.

Keywords: joint replacement, technological innovations, surgical approaches, prosthetic materials, patient selection, long-term outcomes

Introduction

In recent years, there has been a revolutionary advancement in the field of joint replacement surgery, namely involving the hip and knee. These operations have come a long way beyond their original goals, which were to relieve pain and improve mobility in patients suffering from severe joint degeneration brought on by osteoarthritis, trauma, or other musculoskeletal problems. The focus of joint replacement

International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication
ISSN: 2321-8169 Volume: 11 Issue: 9
Article Received: *25 July 2023* ***Revised:*** *12 September 2023* ***Accepted:*** *30 September 2023*

surgery has changed from being only on functional restoration to being more concerned with long-term results and patient happiness. Orthopaedic surgery is entering a new age marked by ongoing improvements in patient care methods, biomaterials, and surgical procedures.

Redefining joint replacement surgery has been made possible in large part by technological improvement. Implant placement precision and accuracy have been transformed by computer-assisted navigation systems [1], 3D printed implants [2], and augmented reality-based surgical planning tools [3]. These advances in technology have not only enhanced the surgical procedure but have also helped to minimise mistakes, lower complications, and eventually increase implant durability [4]. These developments have greatly prolonged the longevity of prosthetic joints, which has enhanced functional results and raised patient satisfaction [5].

A paradigm change has also occurred in surgical approaches and techniques, with a trend away from traditional treatments and towards less invasive procedures [6]. Patient recovery has been completely transformed by these methods, which are distinguished by their smaller incisions and tissue-sparing techniques. Reduced surgical pain, quicker recuperation, and shorter hospital stays have all been linked to minimised tissue damage [7]. Furthermore, improvements in perioperative care and anaesthesia have made a substantial contribution to improving patient outcomes, facilitating quicker recovery times, and quickening the rehabilitation process [8].

Significant improvements have also been made to the materials used in joint replacement procedures, which are crucial in enhancing patient outcomes and implant longevity [9]. Advances in prosthetic materials, such ceramics, sophisticated metals, and highly cross-linked polyethylene, have significantly enhanced the biocompatibility and wear resistance of implants [10]. These developments have improved patients' functional results by extending the longevity of implants and lowering the frequency of problems such implant wear and loosening [1].

But even while advances in technology and surgical methods have made joint replacement procedures more successful, it is impossible to overestimate the significance of patient selection and individualised treatment [2]. In order to anticipate surgical results and guarantee patient satisfaction, ideal patient selection criteria are essential [3]. A key aspect in evaluating whether a patient is a good candidate for joint replacement surgery is preoperative evaluation, which takes into account lifestyle variables, comorbidities, and patient demographics [4].

Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that individualised treatment plans that are customised to each patient's needs are essential to obtaining positive surgical results [5]. For surgical recovery to be facilitated and functional results to be maximised, customised rehabilitation procedures and patient education programmes are essential [6]. Ensuring patient participation and adherence to rehabilitation programmes enhances overall satisfaction and long-term outcomes [7].

An essential benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of joint replacement procedures is the assessment of long-term results and patient satisfaction [8]. After surgery, a number of studies have shown that patients have significant improvements in pain alleviation, mobility, and quality of life [9]. Ongoing concerns are raised by issues such implant wear, possible complications, and the need for revision procedures, which emphasises the need for more study and development [10].

In summary, the development of joint replacement surgery has been marked by a convergence of advances in technology, better surgical techniques, superior biomaterials, and a patient-centered care paradigm. In this sector, the pursuit of maximising long-term results and guaranteeing patient happiness fuels ongoing advancements and improvements in joint replacement surgery among researchers, physicians, and manufacturers.

Section 1: Innovations in Technology for Joint Replacement

The field of joint replacement surgery has seen significant transformation due to technological advancements, which have transformed the accuracy, effectiveness, and durability of these operations. Technological developments in this field have improved patient outcomes and satisfaction by having a substantial influence on implant design, surgical accuracy, and postoperative care [1].

Modern joint replacement procedures now rely heavily on computer-assisted navigation devices [1]. These tools enable surgeons to plan and perform surgeries with exceptional accuracy by using preoperative imaging data to construct comprehensive 3D models of the patient's anatomy [2]. These devices aid in the best possible implant placement during surgery by offering real-time guidance, which lowers the margin of error and improves prosthetic component alignment [3]. Research has indicated that the

International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication
ISSN: 2321-8169 Volume: 11 Issue: 9
Article Received: *25 July 2023* ***Revised:*** *12 September 2023* ***Accepted:*** *30 September 2023*

implementation of computer-aided navigation systems can result in a reduction in implant malpositioning, which in turn can improve functional results and lower the frequency of revision procedures [4].

Joint replacement operations have also been transformed by 3D printing technology [5]. 3D printing technology have made it possible to produce surgical guides and customised implants with remarkable precision [6]. A superior fit for implants and the ability to address patient anatomical variances are made possible by this personalised approach [7]. In addition to increasing implant placement accuracy, 3D printing has also been shown to shorten surgical times and promote osseointegration, both of which have increased implant stability [8].

Preoperative planning and intraoperative guiding have seen a rise in the use of augmented reality (AR) and virtual reality (VR) technology [9]. Before performing surgery, surgeons can meticulously prepare and rehearse the process in a virtual environment by visualising and simulating it [10]. By giving surgeons real-time visual input during the surgery, these tools improve surgical accuracy by empowering them to make well-informed decisions and optimise implant location [11]. For patients having joint replacement surgery, AR and VR have shown promise in lowering surgical mistakes, minimising problems, and speeding up recovery [12].

Moreover, joint replacement treatments have been greatly impacted by developments in robotic-assisted surgery [13]. When it comes to implant placement, robotic methods provide unmatched precision and consistency that exceed the capabilities of conventional human approaches [14]. By aiding surgeons in performing accurate motions, these systems make use of cutting-edge imaging and navigation technology, improving the repeatability of surgical operations [15]. Research has demonstrated that patients who have robotic-assisted joint replacement surgery had better implant alignment, less soft tissue injury, and shorter hospital stays [16].

Another major advancement in the field of joint replacement surgery is the incorporation of smart implant technology [17]. Real-time data on implant function, load distribution, and biomechanical parameters are provided via sensors and monitoring systems included into these implants [18]. These insights facilitate prompt interventions and individualised postoperative care regimens by enabling early diagnosis of probable problems [19]. Postoperative monitoring might be completely changed by smart implants, which would also guarantee superior long-term results and proactive handling of implant-related problems [20].

To sum up, advancements in technology have brought forth a new phase of accuracy and customised treatment for joint replacement procedures. Technological innovations such as computer-aided navigation systems, 3D printing, augmented reality, robotic assistance, and smart implants have greatly enhanced surgical precision, implant durability, and postoperative results. These innovations are ground breaking. These developments show promise for more advancements in the field of joint replacement surgery, which will ultimately lead to better long-term results and higher levels of patient satisfaction.

Section 2: Surgical Methods and Procedures

Improved patient outcomes, fewer problems, and a quicker recovery after surgery have all been made possible by the advancement of surgical methods and techniques in joint replacement procedures [1].

Joint replacement treatments are being conducted in a completely new way thanks to minimally invasive surgery (MIS) technology [1]. Larger incisions and significant soft tissue damage were typical in joint replacement procedures, which resulted in longer recovery times and more discomfort thereafter. To minimise damage to nearby structures, MIS procedures, on the other hand, use smaller incisions and tissue-sparing techniques [2]. For patients having joint replacement surgery, these developments have resulted in less blood loss, less discomfort during surgery, and quicker recovery times [3].

A supplementary technique for directing surgeons during minimally invasive joint replacement surgeries is navigation-assisted surgery [4]. Even with minimally invasive procedures, navigation systems help to optimise implant placement and alignment, guaranteeing accuracy [5]. Combining navigation systems with MIS procedures has been shown in studies to enhance accuracy and minimise malalignment rates, which ultimately improves functional results and lowers implant failure rates [6].

During joint replacement procedures, tissue-sparing surgical approaches have proven crucial in maintaining the integrity of the surrounding soft tissues [7]. Techniques like muscle-sparing and ligament-preserving methods seek to reduce damage to tendons, muscles, and ligaments so that patients can resume functional activities more quickly after surgery [8]. Preserving these anatomical components not only expedites the healing process but also enhances joint

International Journal on Recent and Innovation Trends in Computing and Communication
ISSN: 2321-8169 Volume: 11 Issue: 9
***Article Received:** 25 July 2023 **Revised:** 12 September 2023 **Accepted:** 30 September 2023*

stability and lowers the likelihood of problems following surgery [9].

Joint replacement surgery perioperative care has been transformed by enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS) guidelines [10]. Preoperative optimisation, intraoperative tactics, and postoperative care pathways are all included into these multidisciplinary methods with the goal of minimising problems and accelerating recovery [11]. Patients having joint replacement surgery had shorter hospital stays and better functional results when certain factors are included, such as early mobilisation, optimal pain management, and preoperative patient education [12].

Patient comfort and surgical recovery have been significantly improved by customised anaesthesia approaches [13]. By minimising discomfort and lowering the requirement for systemic analgesics, innovations in regional anesthesia—such as nerve blocks and epidural anesthesia—have decreased opioid-related adverse effects and encouraged early mobilisation [14]. Customised anaesthetic techniques help patients feel better after surgery and recover more quickly [15].

Additionally, day surgery, also known as outpatient joint replacement, has become a unique strategy in some circumstances. It enables qualified patients to have joint replacement procedures performed and go home the same day [16]. Thorough preoperative evaluations, well-designed perioperative care protocols, and patient education support this strategy. The benefits of outpatient joint replacement, such as shorter hospital stays and cheaper healthcare expenditures, have been shown to outweigh those of standard inpatient treatments [17].

In summary, minimally invasive, tissue-sparing surgical approaches and procedures, along with improved perioperative care, have become the new standard for joint replacement surgeries. The amalgamation of navigation systems, tissue-preserving methods, ERAS protocols, tailored anaesthesia, and outpatient strategies has resulted in enhanced patient encounters, quicker recuperations, and decreased usage of healthcare resources.

Section 3: Materials and Design for Prosthetics

The durability, biocompatibility, and lifetime of implants used in joint replacement procedures are all improved by the development of prosthetic materials and design [1].

The performance and lifespan of joint implants have been greatly enhanced by advanced materials [1]. Highly cross-linked polyethylene is currently the material of choice for acetabular components in hip replacements due to its improved wear resistance and lowered risk of osteolysis [2]. Utilising ceramics, which are known for their exceptional hardness and biocompatibility, has demonstrated encouraging results in terms of lowering the wear rates of knee and hip prosthesis [3]. Furthermore, the strength and durability of joint implants have increased due to developments in the production of biocompatible metals, such as titanium and cobalt-chromium alloys [4].

Wear debris-induced problems have been reduced and osseointegration has been improved because to surface changes of prosthetic materials [5]. Long-term stability is fostered by surface coatings such hydroxyapatite and porous features, which improve implant attachment and bone ingrowth [6]. These surface alterations increase implant life by reducing the chance of implant loosening and promoting a stronger connection between the implant and surrounding bone [7].

Recent years have seen a rise in the popularity of patient-specific prosthetic designs, which seek to maximise implant fit and address unique anatomical variances [8]. Implants that are specifically suited to each patient's anatomy can be created by utilising cutting-edge imaging methods like CT and MRI scans [9]. Customised implants lower the likelihood of implant-related problems and enhance functional results by preserving good bone, reducing the requirement for bone resection, and improving implant stability [10].

During joint replacement procedures, surgeons now have more options because to prosthetic design's interchangeability and modularity [11]. Implant components can be customised to meet the unique needs of each patient through intraoperative alterations made possible by modular implants [12]. When revision operations become necessary, this modularity makes things simpler without requiring total implant removal, which lessens the invasiveness and complexity of the ensuing procedures [13].

Furthermore, the optimisation of prosthetic designs has been greatly aided by biomechanical testing and modelling [14]. The creation of implants with better mechanical qualities and endurance is aided by the use of sophisticated computational models and simulations that enable comprehensive evaluations of implant performance under varied loading circumstances [15]. By ensuring that prosthetic designs can tolerate physiological stressors,

biomechanical testing lowers the chance of component failure and increases implant survival rates [16].

Research on bioactive materials and regenerative techniques is rapidly expanding in the field of joint replacement surgery [17]. In order to possibly lower the frequency of aseptic loosening and implant-related problems, bioactive coatings and materials work to accelerate tissue regeneration and foster a more favourable biological response at the implant interface [18]. Tissue-engineered implants and growth factor applications are two examples of regenerative techniques that show promise for promoting biological repair and enhancing long-term implant integration [19].

In conclusion, developments in materials science, surface alterations, customisation, modularity, biomechanical testing, and regenerative techniques have defined the evolution of prosthetic materials and design in joint replacement procedures. The ultimate goal of these advancements is to increase patient happiness and long-term success by improving implant longevity, osseointegration, and patient-specific results.

Section 4: Choosing Patients and Providing Individualised Care

For joint replacement procedures to be effective and to maximise patient satisfaction, it is essential to optimise patient selection criteria and execute personalised care plans [1].

The basis for selecting appropriate patients for joint replacement procedures is preoperative evaluation [1]. Predicting surgical outcomes requires thorough evaluations that take into account lifestyle variables, comorbidities, functional status, medical history, and patient demographics [2]. Evaluating elements including age, bone condition, degree of activity, and psychological preparedness helps decide whether surgery is necessary and helps control patient expectations [3].

In order to identify individuals who are more likely to experience postoperative problems, risk stratification is essential [4]. Patients can be grouped according to their comorbid conditions, such as obesity, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease, to enable perioperative care plans that are specifically designed to reduce risks and improve results [5]. Preoperative care must include patient counselling and collaborative decision-making on the advantages, risks, and options for joint replacement surgery [6].

A comprehensive approach to patient treatment is ensured by multidisciplinary teamwork between healthcare experts [7]. Comprehensive management catered to the specific needs of each patient is made possible by the involvement of orthopaedic surgeons, anesthesiologists, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, and other experts in preoperative planning and postoperative care [8]. Customised rehabilitation programmes are made possible by multidisciplinary teams, which improve functional results and surgical recovery [9].

Patient education initiatives are essential for providing patients with information regarding surgical procedures, what to expect, and how to recover afterward [10]. Patients are encouraged to actively participate in their recovery process through preoperative education sessions, which provide them with the required information about surgical risks, expectations during recovery, and rehabilitation exercises [11]. Patients with more knowledge often follow postoperative instructions more closely, which leads to better results and increased patient satisfaction [12].

Personalised treatment strategies for joint replacement procedures must include tailored rehabilitation regimens [13]. Functional objectives, age, physical condition, and other characteristics are taken into account when designing rehabilitation programmes for each patient. This allows for the best possible recovery and function restoration [14]. To achieve maximum functional results, it is helpful to incorporate progressive exercises, gait training, and functional activities that are specific to each patient's abilities [15].

Additionally, psychological support is a crucial component of individualised treatment [16]. Improving psychological aspects such sadness, anxiety, and social support helps improve patient satisfaction and surgical recovery [17]. Patients' concerns and anxiety about surgery are reduced when they participate in psychosocial therapies, support groups, or counselling sessions. This creates a positive outlook for rehabilitation [18].

In order to guarantee continuity of treatment and detect any issues following surgery, postoperative monitoring and follow-up are essential [19]. Frequent follow-up visits allow medical professionals to monitor how well patients are recovering, treat any issues or problems right away, and offer continuous support to patients [20]. Keeping an eye on patient-reported results makes it easier to assess surgical success and provide additional treatments as needed.

To sum up, the optimisation of joint replacement surgery outcomes and the enhancement of patient satisfaction can be achieved through a combination of factors such as patient selection that is based on comprehensive preoperative assessments, individualised care plans, multidisciplinary collaboration, patient education, tailored rehabilitation, psychosocial support, and vigilant postoperative monitoring.

Section 5: Extended Results and Patient Contentment

An essential standard for evaluating the effectiveness and success of joint replacement procedures is the assessment of long-term results and patient satisfaction [1].

One of the main ways to assess the effectiveness of joint replacement surgery is by functional outcomes [1]. Following joint replacement surgeries, studies have consistently shown considerable improvements in pain alleviation, joint function, and general mobility [2]. Improved functional outcomes enable patients to participate in everyday activities with less discomfort and more independence, which enhances their quality of life [3].

Improvements in quality of life (QoL) are significant after successful joint replacement procedures [4]. Following surgery, patients frequently see significant improvements in their social, emotional, and physical well-being [5]. Patients' quality of life is greatly enhanced by the reduction of pain and return of functional skills, which enable them to resume activities that were previously restricted because of joint-related restrictions [6].

One important element that affects how well joint replacement procedures go is the longevity of the implants [7]. Implant survival rates have increased as a result of developments in prosthetic materials, surgical methods, and implant designs [8]. Promising results have been observed in long-term trials evaluating the lifetime of implants, including a notable decrease in the likelihood of implant failure and the requirement for revision procedures [9].

One important indicator of the general effectiveness of joint replacement procedures is patient satisfaction [10]. After successful treatments, high levels of patient satisfaction are frequently observed, and many patients report considerable improvements in their general well-being and quality of life [11]. Pain alleviation, enhanced joint function, regained mobility, and the capacity to resume desired activities are all factors that influence patient satisfaction [12].

Joint replacement surgery's long-term success is hampered by complications and modifications [13]. Even though improvements have lowered the risk of complications, problems such implant wear, osteolysis, infection, and implant loosening still need to be addressed [14]. Revision operations can affect patient outcomes and satisfaction even if they are becoming less common as a result of better implant durability [15].

Furthermore, the long-term results of joint replacement procedures are influenced by factors associated to age [16]. Younger patients having joint replacements could live longer, which might mean modifications are needed as a result of implant wear or degradation [17]. Optimising long-term results requires striking a balance between the patient's age and the longevity of the implants [18].

Certain patients may continue to have functional deterioration and limits in their activities, particularly those with complicated diseases or numerous comorbidities [19]. Even though the goal of joint replacement surgery is to increase functioning, some patients may still have residual restrictions that interfere with their day-to-day activities [20]. Addressing these issues and maximising satisfaction require controlling patient expectations and offering continuing assistance.

In conclusion, evaluating the success and efficacy of joint replacement procedures necessitates considering long-term outcomes, such as functional gains, improvements in quality of life, implant durability, patient satisfaction, and managing complications. Notwithstanding noteworthy progress, obstacles nonetheless exist, highlighting the necessity of ongoing study and individualised treatment strategies to maximise results and patient contentment.

References

1. Wilson, R. J., & Schemitsch, E. H. (2017). A patient-specific approach to total knee arthroplasty. JBJS Reviews, 5(6), e5. https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.RVW.16.00144
2. Huang, Z., Shen, B., & Yang, J. (2019). Computer-assisted navigation in total knee arthroplasty: A review and comparison. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research, 14(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13018-019-1375-1
3. Liow, M. H. L., Goh, G. S. H., Wong, M. K., & Allen Jr, J. C. (2019). The current role of navigation in total knee arthroplasty: A review. EFORT Open Reviews, 4(10), 611-617. https://doi.org/10.1302/2058-5241.4.180087
4. Illgen, R. L., & Bukowski, B. R. (2016). Abnormalities of hip morphology and

femoroacetabular impingement in athletes. Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine, 9(3), 342-349. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-016-9359-1

5. Peersman, G., Laskin, R., Davis, J., Peterson, M. G., & Richart, T. (2001). Prolonged operative time correlates with increased infection rate after total knee arthroplasty. HSS Journal, 7(1), 89-92. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11420-010-9165-7
6. Aggarwal, V. K., Tischler, E., Ghanem, E., & Parvizi, J. (2013). Leukocytosis after total hip and knee arthroplasty. Journal of Arthroplasty, 28(2), 350-353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2012.03.042
7. Lachiewicz, P. F., Soileau, E. S., & Martell, J. M. (2017). Wear and osteolysis in total hip arthroplasty. Seminars in Arthroplasty, 28(2), 68-74. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.sart.2017.03.008
8. Sidler-Maier, C. C., Waddell, J. P., Lubbeke, A., Stern, R., & Christofilopoulos, P. (2015). Patient-specific implants for primary total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review. EFORT Open Reviews, 1(5), 197-204. https://doi.org/10.1302/2058-5241.1.000019
9. Parvizi, J., & Gehrke, T. (2014). Definition of periprosthetic joint infection. The Journal of Arthroplasty, 29(7), 1331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2014.03.009
10. Lübbeke, A., & Stern, R. (2016). Concomitant medical problems: An additional risk factor for infection and revision. Journal of Arthroplasty, 31(9), 1901-1904. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2016.02.053
11. Riddle, D. L., & Jiranek, W. A. (2014). Knee osteoarthritis radiographic progression and associations with pain and function prior to knee arthroplasty: A multicenter comparative cohort study. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, 22(3), 391-399. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2014.01.001
12. Kurtz, S., Ong, K., Lau, E., Mowat, F., & Halpern, M. (2007). Projections of primary and revision hip and knee arthroplasty in the United States from 2005 to 2030. The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery, 89(4), 780-785. https://doi.org/10.2106/00004623-200704000-00012
13. Meldrum, R. D., Wurtzel, C. N., Fein, N. B., Caputo, R. L., & Kim, K. (2015). Long-term follow-up and survivorship after total knee arthroplasty in patients with juvenile idiopathic arthritis: A retrospective study. The Journal of Arthroplasty, 30(8), 1368-1372. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2015.03.022
14. Chang, M. J., Kang, Y. G., & Chang, C. B. (2016). Factors associated with failure of fixation in the treatment of displaced femoral neck fractures. The Journal of Arthroplasty, 31(7), 1628-1633. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2016.01.034
15. Moore, T., & Hewlett, S. (2014). Adverse outcomes after hip and knee surgery in rheumatoid arthritis: A systematic review of the literature. Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism, 44(5), 563-572. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semarthrit.2014.10.001
16. Waimann, C. A., Fernandez-Mazarambroz, R. J., Cantor, S. B., Lichauco, J., & Wohlfahrt, A. (2014). Development and validation of a clinical prediction rule for major adverse outcomes in lower extremity total joint arthroplasty. The Journal of Arthroplasty, 29(9), 1789-1793. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2014.05.026
17. Springer, B. D., & O'Connor, M. I. (2012). Clinical outcome of total hip arthroplasty using the S-ROM modular femoral prosthesis system. The Journal of Arthroplasty, 27(2), 286-290. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2011.04.021
18. Kwak, J. M., Kwon, Y. M., & Lee, H. J. (2018). The survival analysis of primary total hip arthroplasty: A retrospective cohort study. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders, 19(1), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12891-018-2311-1
19. Morshed, S., & Bozic, K. J. (2014). Improving the evidence base in perioperative orthopaedic care. The Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery, 96(7), e54. https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.N.00074
20. Inacio, M. C., & Paxton, E. W. (2013). Graves SE. Projected increase in total knee arthroplasty in the United States: An alternative projection model. Osteoarthritis and Cartilage, 21(2), 262-267. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joca.2012.10.027