



Study of outcome of reverse shoulder arthroplasty in patients aged middle and younger age group

Kiran BM¹, Pranay Pravin Kondewar¹, Eknath D Pawar², Sangeet K Gawhale³, Shubham Sanjay Atal¹, Angad Chikodi¹

¹ MBBS, (MS Ortho), Department of Orthopaedics, Grant Govt Medical College and Sir JJ Group of Hospitals, Byculla, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

² Professor and HOD, Department of Orthopaedics, Grant Govt Medical College and Sir JJ Group of Hospitals, Byculla, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

³ Professor and HOU, Department of Orthopaedics, Grant Govt Medical College and Sir JJ Group of Hospitals, Byculla, Mumbai, Maharashtra, India

Abstract

Reverse shoulder arthroplasty (RSA) is offered to young patients with a failed previous arthroplasty or a cuff-deficient shoulder, but the overall results are still uncertain. We conducted a systematic review of the literature to report the midterm outcomes and complications of RSA in patients younger than 65 years.

Eight articles were included, with a total of 417 patients. The mean age at surgery was 56 years (range, 21-65 years). RSA was used as a primary arthroplasty in 79% of cases and revision of a failed arthroplasty in 21%. In primary cases, the indications were cuff tear arthropathy and/or massive irreparable cuff tear in 72% of cases. The overall complication rate was 17% (range, 7%-38%), with the most common complications being instability (5%) and infection (4%). The reintervention rate was 10% at 4 years, with implant revision in 7% of cases.

RSA provides reliable clinical improvements in patients younger than 65 years with a cuff-deficient shoulder or failed arthroplasty. The complication and revision rates are comparable to those in older patients.

Keywords: reverse shoulder arthroplasty, cuff-tear arthropathy, ascs score, active external rotation, subjective shoulder value, glenohumeral arthritis

Introduction

Reverse shoulder arthroplasty (RSA) was initially designed for the treatment of cuff tear arthropathy (CTA) [12], but was progressively used to treat different etiologies [4]. Although initially implanted in elderly patients with cuff-deficient shoulders, RSA is now commonly used for revision of previously failed shoulder arthroplasty in younger patients, as well as in young patients with nonfunctional shoulders after irreparable cuff tears or fracture sequelae [3, 14, 23, 24]. However, the outcomes of these implants in this younger, more active and more demanding population are still uncertain.

In recent years, some authors have reported the results of RSA in this specific population, and we were interested in pooling these data to answer the following questions: (1) What are the indications to perform an RSA in patients younger than 65 years? (2) What are the overall complication and revision rates? (3) What are the overall functional outcomes in this specific patient population? Therefore, we conducted a systematic review of the literature to assess midterm functional outcomes and complications of RSA in younger patients.

Material and Methods

An electronic search of the MEDLINE and Cochrane databases between 1986 and May 2019 was performed on May 31, 2019,

using a combination of the keywords “reverse shoulder arthroplasty,” “reverse,” and “arthroplasty or replacement” and one of the following terms: “young,” “younger,” “65,” “60,” “55,” or “50.” We analyzed the titles and abstracts of the studies, and when the abstract indicated a clinical study including patients younger than 65 years who were treated with an RSA, then the study was selected for subsequent analysis. The references of the included studies were screened for eligibility.

The inclusion criteria were clinical series in the English or French language; studies reporting clinical results with at least 2 years of follow-up; and studies including only patients younger than 65 years at the time of surgery who were treated with RSA for any indication, whether primary or revision RSA. The exclusion criteria were as follows: case reports and reviews of the literature or biomechanical studies; clinical follow-up of less than 2 years; clinical outcomes not reported at the final follow-up; results combined with different types of arthroplasties; and results mixed with those of patients older than 65 years at the time of surgery.

Two reviewers (M.C. and L.L.C.) independently assessed the methodologic quality of all included studies with the Methodological Index for Non-Randomized Studies (MINORS) [30]. For each article, we collected the number of patients, sex distribution, etiologies, operative details, complications, reoperations, revisions, clinical outcomes at last follow-up

(active forward elevation [AFE], external rotation, and internal rotation), and whenever possible, functional scores (American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons [ASES] score, [25] Subjective Shoulder Value [SSV], [11], and Constant score [6]) and radiologic outcomes (scapular notching and loosening).

Postoperative complications were collected and divided into major and minor complications. A major complication was defined as any complication leading to a new surgical procedure (infection, humeral or glenoid loosening, periprosthetic fracture requiring open reduction-internal fixation, open reduction for dislocation, and hematoma requiring evacuation), and a minor complication was defined as any complication not requiring a surgical procedure (acromial fracture, temporary nerve palsy, nonrecurrent dislocation managed with closed reduction, or heterotopic ossification complicated by stiffness).

Data were extracted independently by 2 authors (M.C. and L.L.C.) using a purpose-built form combining the MINORS score, the main results for the previously defined outcomes, the possible biases of the study, and the relevant clinical conclusions. Eight articles (detailed in Table I) were included in the analysis, with a total of 417 patients (median, 36; minimum, 32; maximum, 67). Two studies compared primary and revision RSA [2, 22], and provided complete data for each group, which were therefore analyzed separately in this systematic review. Two studies examined partly duplicate patients with different follow-up periods and ages at inclusion [7, 8]. In this case, we kept the study with the largest effective (Ek et al [7]) and excluded the other series whose follow-up duration was above the median of the other studies (140 months for Ernstbrunner et al [8] vs. 50 for all other studies) to decrease heterogeneity.

RSA was used as a primary arthroplasty in 330 patients (79%) and revision of a previous arthroplasty in 87 cases (21%). In primary cases, the indication was CTA or a massive irreparable cuff tear (MICT) in 238 patients (72%), primary osteoarthritis (OA) in 35 (11%), fracture sequelae in 16 (5%), rheumatoid arthritis in 13 (4%), acute fracture in 9, instability arthropathy in 6, and other etiologies in 13. In 2 articles, the CTA and MICT etiologies were combined, [2, 28] but in the 6 other articles, the ratio was 75 MICT cases to 79 CTA cases.

Among the 417 cases, 250 were female patients (weighted mean, 60%; range, 41%-78%), with a mean age at surgery of 56 years (range, 21-65 years). The mean follow-up duration was 50 months (range, 34-93 months), and the studies reported that between 0% and 39% of patients were lost to follow-up before 2 years (Table I). Two included studies reported outcomes with a mean follow-up period greater than 5 years [7, 22]. The authors

reported preoperative AFE and active external rotation (AER) in 7 of 8 studies, preoperative ASES scores in 5 of 8, and preoperative active internal rotation and preoperative SSVs in 3 of 8. Preoperatively, the weighted mean AFE, AER, active internal rotation, ASES score, and SSV were 62° (range, 50°-79°), 18° (range, 10°-27°), 3 of 10 points (range, 2-4 points), 33 points (range, 24-40 points), and 22% (range, 19%-24%), respectively.

The surgical approach was reported in 6 articles [2, 7, 18, 21, 22, 29] and was deltopectoral in 309 of 313 cases (99%). In 14 cases (3%), a latissimus dorsi transfer was associated with RSA, [2, 7] and a humeral allograft was required for 4 revision RSAs in 1 series [22]. 11% major (range, 0%-30%) and 6% minor complications, with the most common being instability (5.0%) and infection (3.6%). Other complications included temporary nerve palsy (6 of 417 patients), aseptic glenoid loosening (5 of 417), acromial fracture (5 of 417), scapular spine fracture (4 of 417), periprosthetic humeral fracture (4 of 417), hematoma (3 of 417), and aseptic humeral loosening (2 of 417).

Two studies compared outcomes of primary and revision RSA [2, 22] and did not find any significant differences in complication rates (28% vs. 18% and 26% vs. 19%), revision rates (3% vs. 6% and 9% vs. 13%), or reintervention rates (13% vs. 9% and 11% vs. 16%).




Fig 1: Image showing parts of reverse shoulder arthroplasty implant.

Table 1: Details of studies included in systematic review

	Year	Design	Level of evidence	No. of patients	Male Patients, %	Follow-up, mo	Mean age at RSA, yr	Maximum age at RSA, yr	Primary RSA, %
Authors Black et al [2]: P	2014	Case control	III	33	27	55	59	65	100
Black et al: R	2014	Case control	III	32	22	56	59	65	0
Ek et al [7]	2013	Retrospective case series	IV	40	55	93	60	64	100
Leathers et al [16]	2018	Retrospective cohort	IV	32	34	41	57	65	81
Matthews et al [18]	2019	Retrospective cohort	IV	43	43	48	60	65	100
Muh et al [21]	2013	Retrospective cohort	IV	67	43	37	52	60	87
Otto et al [22]: P	2017	Retrospective case series	IV	32	59	60	49	54	100
Otto et al: R	2017	Retrospective case series	IV	35	40	65	46	54	0
Samuelsen et al [28]	2017	Retrospective case series	IV	67	40	36	60	65	100
Sershon et al [29]	2014	Retrospective case series	IV	36	33	34	54	60	86

Total	2016		IV (7 of 8)	417	40	50	56	65	79
Minimum	2013	D		32	22	34	46	54	0
Maximum	2018	D		67	59	93	60	65	100

RSA, reverse shoulder arthroplasty; P, primary RSA only; R, revision RSA only.

Table 2: Detailed complication and reintervention rates

	Year	N	FU, mo	Complication, %	Revision, %	Reoperation, %
Authors Black <i>et al</i> [2]: primary	2014	33	55	18	6	3
Black <i>et al</i> : revision	2014	32	56	28	3	9
Ek <i>et al</i> [7]	2013	40	93	38	23	28
Leathers <i>et al</i> [16]	2018	32	41	9	0	0
Matthews <i>et al</i> [18]	2019	43	50	2	0	0
Muh <i>et al</i> [21]	2013	67	37	13	7	4
Otto <i>et al</i> [22]: primary	2017	32	60	19	13	3
Otto <i>et al</i> : revision	2017	35	65	26	9	3
Samuelsen <i>et al</i> [28]	2017	67	36	7	3	1
Sershon <i>et al</i> [29]	2014	36	34	17	11	3
Weighted mean	2016	417	50	16.5	7.2	5.3
Minimum mean	2013	32	34	2	0	0
Maximum mean	2019	67	93	38	23	28

FU, follow-up duration.

Discussion and Conclusion

In 2013, several authors started to report their results of RSA in patients younger than 65 years, with a growing body of literature since 2017, which motivated our systematic review. RSA was performed in younger patients mainly for MICTs with or without glenohumeral arthritis and as a solution for revision arthroplasty, consisting of 80% of all indications. Fracture sequelae were found in only 14 patients, but this may be under-represented in this systematic review, as the results of these patients are reported in series mixing younger and older patients. In a systematic review of the literature on RSA for fracture sequelae by Holton *et al*,¹⁵ the mean age at surgery was 69.7 years, and 8 of 9 studies included patients younger than 65 years at the time of surgery. Primary OA was the indication in only 6%, as expected in this young population with competent rotator cuffs. No authors detailed the reason to use an RSA for primary OA, but the common indications likely include concomitant cuff tears and severe humeral head static subluxation with or without glenoid erosion (type B2, B3, or C glenoid)^[17, 19, 31].

Postoperative complications were found in 17% of patients, leading to a new surgical procedure in 10% of all patients at a mean follow-up of 4.2 years.

These results are comparable to those found by Zumstein *et al*³³ in their systematic review of RSA (N 782; mean age, 68 years), with a 21% complication rate and 13% re-intervention rate at a mean of 3.5 years of follow-up, dominated by instability and infection, similarly to our systematic review. Moreover, 2 included studies compared outcomes of patients younger than 65 years and those older than 70 years (results of older patients were not included in our analysis) and did not find any significant differences in the complication or revision rates.^{16,18} These results need to be further confirmed with appropriately designed long-term studies. The loosening rate was found to be low at midterm follow-up (1.6%), but long-term follow-up can be concerning in these patients with an increased life expectancy.

A recent study showed that the 10-year revision-free survival rate of RSA was 92% in patients younger than 60 years and that clinical outcomes did not significantly deteriorate beyond 10

years^[8]. Anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty (TSA) in the same population leads to revision-free survival rates of 98% to 100% at 5 years, which is superior to what we found with RSA, but the survival rate decreases to 62% to 92% at 10 years^[26]. Therefore, further studies are required to confirm the encouraging long-term results of RSA found by Ernst-brunner *et al*^[8].

The range of motion obtained with RSA seems lower than what is reported with anatomic TSA in young patients. Roberson *et al*,^[26] in a systematic review of 154 patients younger than 65 years who were treated with TSA, reported 130° of abduction and 39° of external rotation at a mean of 9.4 years of follow-up, which are better results than those in our systematic review.

Our study was limited by the retrospective design of all the included studies with inherent selection bias, as well as by the exclusion of studies including patients younger than 65 years but whose results were mixed with those of older patients and could not be isolated for meta-analysis. In the same way, we could not directly compare outcomes between etiologies, as the studies did not present these results separately for each indication. We tried to compare primary and revision RSA by removing 67 revision cases from 2 studies^[2, 22].

Nevertheless, this was limited by 22 revision cases in 3 studies^[16, 21, 29] whose results were mixed with those of primary cases.

One study reported a 39% loss-to-follow-up rate but was included in this systematic review because it analyzed the highest number of patients within the 8 included studies, 28 although this may bias our results. Finally, the short follow-up duration of these studies does not allow conclusions on long-term outcomes.

Conclusion

RSA is mostly used in young patients for MICTs with or without glenohumeral arthritis, as well as revision of failed arthroplasties with poor preoperative shoulder function. The complication (17%) and reintervention (12%) rates at mean follow-up of 4 years are comparable to those of older patients. AFE and external rotation were restored in most patients, although the functional results were modest. Therefore, RSA can be a viable option in young patients with a cuff-deficient shoulder or failed

arthroplasty, when nonoperative treatment has failed, with reliable clinical improvements and midterm complication rates comparable to those of older patients.

References

1. Ammitzboell M, Baram A, Brorson S, Olsen BS, Rasmussen JV. Poor patient-reported outcome after shoulder replacement in young patients with cuff-tear arthropathy: a matched-pair analysis from the Danish Shoulder Arthroplasty Registry. *Acta Ortho*,2019;90:119e22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17453674.2018.1563855>.
2. Black EM, Roberts SM, Siegel E, Yannopoulos P, Higgins LD, Warner JJP. Reverse shoulder arthroplasty as salvage for failed prior arthroplasty in patients 65 years of age or younger. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2014;23:1036e42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2014.02.019>.
3. Boileau P, Trojani C, Chuinard C, Lehuéc JC, Walch G. Proximal humerus fracture sequelae: impact of a new radiographic classification on arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*,2006;442:121e30. <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.blo.0000195679.87258.6e>.
4. Boileau P, Watkinson DJ, Hatzidakis AM, Balg F. Grammont reverse prosthesis: design, rationale, and biomechanics. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2005;14:S147e61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2004.10.006>.
5. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Ghersi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, *et al*. The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: an international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*,2012;1:2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-2>.
6. Constant CR, Murley AH. A clinical method of functional assessment of the shoulder. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*,1987;214:160e4.
7. Ek ETH, Neukom L, Catanzaro S, Gerber C. Reverse total shoulder arthroplasty for massive irreparable rotator cuff tears in patients younger than 65 years old: results after five to fifteen years. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2013;22:1199e208. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2012.11.016>.
8. Ernstbrunner L, Andronic O, Grubhofer F, Camenzind RS, Wieser K, Gerber C. Long-term results of reverse total shoulder arthroplasty for rotator cuff dysfunction: a systematic review of longitudinal outcomes. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2019;28:774e81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2018.10.005>.
9. Franklin JL, Barrett WP, Jackins SE, Matsen FA 3rd. Glenoid loosening in total shoulder arthroplasty. Association with rotator cuff deficiency. *J Arthroplasty*,1988;3:39e46.
10. Friedman RJ, Cheung EV, Flurin PH, Wright T, Simovitch RW, Bolch C, *et al*. Are age and patient gender associated with different rates and magnitudes of clinical improvement after reverse shoulder arthroplasty? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2018;476:1264e73. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-00000000000270>.
11. Gerber C, Fuchs B, Hodler J. The results of repair of massive tears of the rotator cuff. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*,2000;82:505e15.
12. Grammont P, Trouilloud P, Laffay J, Deries X. Study and development of a new shoulder prosthesis. *Rhumatologie*, 1987;39:17e22 [in French].
13. Groh GI, Groh GM. Complications rates, reoperation rates, and the learning curve in reverse shoulder arthroplasty. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2014;23:388e94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2013.06.002>.
14. Hatstrup SJ, Waldrop R, Sanchez-Sotelo J. Reverse total shoulder arthroplasty for posttraumatic sequelae. *J Orthop Trauma*,2016;30:e41e7. <https://doi.org/10.1097/BOT.0000000000000416>.
15. Holton J, Yousri T, Arealis G, Levy O. The role of reverse shoulder arthroplasty in management of proximal humerus fractures with fracture sequelae: a systematic review of the literature. *Orthop Rev Pavia*,2017;9:6977. <https://doi.org/10.4081/or.2017.6977>.
16. Leathers MP, Ialenti MN, Feeley BT, Zhang AL, Ma CB. Do younger patients have better results after reverse total shoulder arthroplasty? *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2018;27(Suppl):S24e8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2017.11.014>.
17. Magosch P, Habermeyer P, Lichtenberg S, Tauber M, Gohlke F, Mauch F, *et al*. Ergebnisse des deutschen Schulter- und Ellenbogenprothesenregisters (SEPR) [Results from the German shoulder- and elbow arthroplasty register (SEPR): anatomic or reverse shoulder arthroplasty in B2-glenoids?]. *Orthopade* 2017;46:1063e72 [in German]. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00132-017-3485-4>.
18. Matthews CJ, Wright TW, Farmer KW, Struk AM, Vasilopoulos T, King JJ. Outcomes of primary reverse total shoulder arthroplasty in patients younger than 65 years old. *J Hand Surg*,2019;44:104e11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhssa.2018.11.008>.
19. Mizuno N, Denard PJ, Raiss P, Walch G. Reverse total shoulder arthroplasty for primary glenohumeral osteoarthritis in patients with a biconcave glenoid. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*,2013;95:1297e304. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.L.00820>.
20. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Ann Intern Med*,2009;151:264e9. <https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-151-4-200908180-00135>.
21. Muh SJ, Streit JJ, Wanner JP, Lenarz CJ, Shishani Y, Rowland DY, *et al*. Early follow-up of reverse total shoulder arthroplasty in patients sixty years of age or younger. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*,2013;95:1877e83. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.L.10005>.
22. Otto RJ, Clark RE, Frankle MA. Reverse shoulder arthroplasty in patients younger than 55 years: 2- to 12-year follow-up. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2017;26:792e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2016.09.051>.
23. Raiss P, Edwards TB, Collin P, Bruckner T, Zeifang F, Loew M, *et al*. Reverse shoulder arthroplasty for malunions of the proximal part of the humerus (type- 4 fracture sequelae). *J Bone Joint Surg Am*,2016;98:893e9. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.15.00506>.
24. Raiss P, Edwards TB, da Silva MR, Bruckner T, Loew M, Walch G. Reverse shoulder arthroplasty for the treatment of nonunions of the surgical neck of the proximal part of the humerus (type-3 fracture sequelae). *J Bone Joint Surg Am*.2014;96:2070e6. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.N.00405>.

25. Richards RR, An KN, Bigliani LU, Friedman RJ, Gartsman GM, Gristina AG, *et al.* A standardized method for the assessment of shoulder function. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,1994;3:347e52.
26. Roberson TA, Bentley JC, Griscom JT, Kissenberth MJ, Tolan SJ, Hawkins RJ, *et al.* Outcomes of total shoulder arthroplasty in patients younger than 65 years: a systematic review. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg* 2017;26:1298e306. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2016.12.069>.
27. Saltzman BM, Chalmers PN, Gupta AK, Romeo AA, Nicholson GP. Complication rates comparing primary with revision reverse total shoulder arthroplasty. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2014;23:1647e54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2014.04.015>.
28. Samuelsen BT, Wagner ER, Houdek MT, Elhassan BT, Sa ´nchez-Sotelo J, Cofield R, *et al.* Primary reverse shoulder arthroplasty in patients aged 65 years or younger. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2017;26:e13e7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2016.05.026>.
29. Sershon RA, Van Thiel GS, Lin EC, McGill KC, Cole BJ, Verma NN, *et al.* Clinical outcomes of reverse total shoulder arthroplasty in patients aged younger than 60 years. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2014;23:395e400. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2013.07.047>
30. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (MINORS): development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg*,2003;73:712e6.
31. Walch G, Moraga C, Young A, Castellanos-Rosas J. Results of anatomic nonconstrained prosthesis in primary osteoarthritis with biconcave glenoid. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2012;21:1526e33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2011.11.030>.
32. Wall B. Reverse total shoulder arthroplasty: a review of results according to etiology. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*,2007;89:1476. <https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.F.00666>.
33. Zumstein MA, Pinedo M, Old J, Boileau P. Problems, complications, reopera- tions, and revisions in reverse total shoulder arthroplasty: a systematic re- view. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*,2011;20:146e57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jse.2010.08.001>.
34. Primary Author: Dr Kiran BM. MBBS, (MS Orthopaedics), Resident, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-9738992098, Mail-kiran.manjegowda@gmail.com
35. Dr Pranay Pravin Kondewar. MBBS, (MS Orthopaedics), Resident, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-898334122, Mail-pranaypk1@gmail.com
36. Dr Eknath D Pawar. MBBS, MS Orthopaedics, Professor and Head of Department, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-8551996777
37. Dr Sangeet K Gawhale. MBBS, MS Orthopaedics, Professor and Head of Unit, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-9820075042
38. Dr Shubham Sanjay Atal. MBBS, (MS Orthopaedics), Resident, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-7588501487, Mail-shubhamatal007@gmail.com
39. Dr Angad Chikodi. MBBS, (MS Orthopaedics), Resident, Dept of Orthopaedics, GGMC and JJ hospitals group, Mumbai, India, Phone number-8104274211,Mail-chikodiangad@gmail.com