



Original article

Enhanced recovery short-stay hip and knee joint replacement program improves patients outcomes while reducing hospital costs



Pascal-André Vendittoli^{a,*}, Karina Pellei^a, François Desmeules^a, Vincent Massé^a, Christian Loubert^b, Martin Lavigne^a, Josée Fafard^c, Louis-Philippe Fortier^b

^a Surgery Department, Montreal University, hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont, 5415, boulevard de l'Assomption, H1T 2M4 Montréal, Québec, Canada

^b Anesthesia Department, Montreal University, hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont, 5415, boulevard de l'Assomption, H1T 2M4 Montréal, Québec, Canada

^c Internal Medicine Department, Montreal University, hôpital Maisonneuve-Rosemont, 5415, boulevard de l'Assomption, H1T 2M4 Montréal, Québec, Canada

I N F O A R T I C L E

Historique de l'article :

Reçu le 2 avril 2019

Accepté le 27 août 2019

A B S T R A C T

Introduction. – An attractive option to reduce hospital length of stay (LOS) after hip or knee joint replacement (THA, TKA) is to follow the Enhanced Recovery After Surgery principles (ERAS) to improve patient experience to a level where they will feel confident to leave for home earlier. The objective of this study was to evaluate the implementation of short-stay protocol following the ERAS principles.

Hypothesis. – We hypothesized that our ERAS THA and TKA short-stay protocol would result in a lower complication rate, shorter hospital LOS and reduced direct health care costs compared to our standard procedure.

Material and methods. – We compared the complications rated according to Clavien-Dindo scale, hospital LOS and costs of the episode of care between a prospective cohort of 120 ERAS short-stay THA or TKA and a matched historical control group of 150 THA or TKA.

Results. – Significantly lower rate of Grade 1 and 2 complications in the ERAS short-stay group compared with the standard group (mean 0.8 vs 3.0, $p < 0.001$). No difference was found between the 2 groups for Grade 3, 4, or 5 complications. The mean hospital LOS for the ERAS short-stay group decreased by 2.8 days for the THAs (0.1 vs 2.9 days, $p < 0.001$) and 3.9 days for the TKAs (1.0 vs 4.9 days, $p < 0.001$). The mean estimated direct health care costs reduction with the ERAS short-stay protocol was 1489 CAD per THA and 4158 CAD per TKA.

Discussion. – In many short-stay protocols, focus has shifted from ERAS goals of a reduction in complications and improved recuperation to use length of stay as the main factor of success. Implementation of an ERAS short-stay protocol for patients undergoing THA or TKA at our institution resulted not only in reduced hospital LOS, but also in improved patient care and reduced direct health care costs.

Level of evidence. – Level II.

© 2019 L'Auteur(s). Publié par Elsevier Masson SAS. Cet article est publié en Open Access sous licence CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

In recent years, there has been a shift toward outpatient and short-stay protocols for patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty (THA) or total knee arthroplasty (TKA). This is due, in part, to improvements in surgical technique and perioperative care, but also in response to pressure to reduce health care costs. Several retrospective studies have shown no significant differences in overall postoperative complications or hospital readmissions between

outpatient/short-stay and inpatient THA or TKA [1–3]. There are few prospective studies comparing health and economic outcomes between short-stay and standard inpatient THA or TKA [4–7]. There are multiple ways of implementing a successful day surgery program. Returning patients home may be possible by transferring part of the in-hospital care to patients' home. However, the main goal of short-stay protocols, adhering to the principles of enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS), is to improve patient recovery to a level where the patient will be able to leave the hospital sooner [8,9]. ERAS Short-stay protocols require the involvement of a multidisciplinary team, including anesthesiologists, surgeons, nurses, and physiotherapists, who adhere to specifically-designed protocols on perioperative care and adjust their practices upon the evolving scientific knowledge.

* Corresponding author.

Adresse e-mail : pa.vendittoli@me.com (P.-A. Vendittoli).

We developed a perioperative THA and TKA short stay protocol following the ERAS principles, aiming at optimizing patients' outcomes to reduce the hospital length of stay (LOS) < 24 h and allow discharging them directly home [8]. The key elements of our protocol were selected to be effective in reducing adverse events and felt to be applicable in our public hospital. We aimed at: reducing pain while minimizing opioids use and their side effects, avoiding patient sedation, improving patients' early function and mobilization, minimizing postoperative anemia, improving perioperative bowel function, decreasing wound complication and finally reducing the DVT risk.

Therefore, the goal of this study was to evaluate the implementation of our protocol in a prospective cohort of 120 patients undergoing THA or TKA by comparing the complication rate with a retrospective cohort of 150 patients meeting the same inclusion/exclusion criteria. Secondary objectives were to compare the hospital LOS and costs between these 2 groups. We hypothesized that our ERAS short-stay protocol would result in a lower complication rate and a shorter LOS and reduced direct health care costs of care compared to the standard procedure.

2. Patients and methods

2.1. ERAS short-stay group

This study was conducted at the Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital Center from June 2016 to August 2018. Patients 18 to 75 years of age, awaiting primary THA or TKA, treated by 6 surgeons (P-AV, MF, ML, VM, AR, and M-OK) were offered to undergo surgery using the ERAS short-stay protocol. The selected subjects were discharged home on the day of surgery for THA and < 24 h for TKA. Patients were included in the study if they were able to give informed consent and did not present an exclusion criteria.

2.2. Exclusion criteria

- Contraindication to some drugs or procedures included in the protocol;
- Absence of relative or friend to help returning home;
- Locomotor or physical handicaps preventing safe post-op mobilization;
- Living further than 50 km from the hospital;
- Lack of home services offered by the local community service in the area;
- Need for long-term urinary Foley catheter post-op or at risk of urinary retention;
- Psychiatric disease limiting participation;
- Coagulation disorder;
- Current or in the past year, systemic corticotherapy (unless confirmation of cortrosyn test prior to surgery);
- Systemic disease necessitating special perioperative care (intensive care, multiple transfusion, dialysis, etc);
- Treatment with a major CYP3A4 substrate or potent CYP3A4 inhibitor;
- CLCR < 30 mL/min (Cockcroft-Gault Formula);
- Body mass index (BMI) > 40 kg/m².

2.3. ERAS Short-stay protocol

pdf documents available online in the [Supplementary material](#): protocol description and patients information booklet.

Perioperative interventions were:

- patients evaluation and preparation in the preoperative assessment clinic (1–2 months before scheduled surgery day, see

detailed description online in the [Supplementary material](#) section);

- food intake: Solid food was allowed until midnight and clear liquids until the surgery [10];
- preemptive medication within 2 hours before surgery (oral administration): acetaminophen 1 g, long acting oxycodone 10 mg, celecoxib 400 mg, pregabalin 150 mg for TKA and 50 mg for THA, Aprepitant 125 mg, scopolamine patch 1.5 mg [11–15];
- IV medications before surgery: selected prophylactic antibiotic, dexamethasone 6 mg IV, tranexamic acid, 1 g IV (max 15 mg/kg) before skin incision [16,17];
- anesthesia: Lumbar epidural anesthesia with xylocaine 2% (10–15cc) and deep propofol (diisopropylphenol) sedation [18]. In case of contraindication to or failure of epidural anesthesia, total intravenous anesthesia with propofol and remifentanyl was used;
- application of intermittent compression legs device to the opposite side;
- surgery;
 - surgical approach left to the surgeon preference (all posterior),
 - TKA avoid the use of the tourniquet, but permitted for cementing [19],
 - THA large diameter (≥ 36 mm) bearing [20],
 - periarticular infiltration protocol (ropivacaine 400 mg, toradol 30 mg and adrenaline) [21],
 - closing the fascia with Stratafix 1.0 [22],
 - closing the skin with sub cuticular suture,
 - sealed wound with the Prineo Closure System™ [23],
 - 1 g IV tranexamic acid (max 15 mg/kg) prior to closing the surgical site,
 - epidural catheter removed in the operation room,
 - application of intermittent legs compression device to the surgical side,
 - TKA: positioning cushion keeping the knee bent at 60–70 degrees [24].

Post-operative interventions:

- pain control by a multimodal analgesia protocol (avoid SC or IV drugs and narcotics if possible):
 - Acetaminophen 1000 mg every 8 hours for 30–60 days,
 - Celecoxib 100 mg twice a day for 30 days,
 - Pregabalin 75 mg at bed time for 30 days only for TKA,
 - Tramadol 50–100 mg orally every 4–6 hours as needed, if insufficient, add oxycodone 5–7.5 mg orally every 3 hours;
- start feeding at patient's desire;
- applying ice 20 minutes every 2 hours as needed for THA and cryocompression 30 minutes every 2 hours for TKA [25];
- discontinue IV fluid if vital signs stable (3–5 h post op);
- no range of motion restriction of the operated joint;
- 3–4 hours after surgery remove bending cushion for TKA;
- 4–6 h first physical therapy session: First attempt to stand and walk, evaluate safety and autonomy during walking and transfers;
- thromboprophylaxis with rivaroxaban 10 mg orally to begin the day after surgery (14 days for TKA and 5 days for THA, followed by 80 mg aspirin PO for 30 days) [26].

Additional details of preoperative and postoperative phases can be found in the [Supplementary material](#).

3. Control group

The selection of patients for the control group was carried out by reviewing medical records of 200 consecutive patients

from Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital who were hospitalized between 2012 and 2015 for a primary THA or TKA. We selected the first 150 meeting the same inclusion and exclusion criteria applied for the ERAS short-stay patients. Interventions for this group varied between cases according to each collaborators' preferences and patient's particularities. A detailed description of the interventions for the control group can be found in the [Supplementary Material Table S1](#) and represents our standard practice before the ERAS short stay protocol introduction.

4. Methods of assessment

For the ERAS short stay group, the data (pain level, length of stay, complications, satisfaction, clinical scores, etc.) was collected prospectively by one researcher (KP) by direct observation during the hospital stay, by telephonic interview on postoperative day 1, 2 and 3 and, in person during post-operative patient's visit at 6 weeks, 3 months, 6 months and 1 year. Complications were categorized using the Clavien-Dindo classification [27] where Grade 1 are minor events requiring no therapy (with exceptions of analgesic, antipyretic, anti-emetic, antibiotic for superficial wound infection or urinary tract infection, etc.); Grade 2 complications require pharmacological treatment with drugs other than such allowed for grade 1 or other interventions as bladder catheter, blood transfusion or close reduction of a dislocated THA for examples; Grade 3 complications require surgical intervention (deep joint infection or displaced fracture for examples) and may lead to lasting disability; Grade 4 complications are life-threatening and require intensive care management and finally; Grade 5 complications are leading to patient death.

For the control group, data (length of stay, complication, etc.) was retrieved from the patients' files by KP. Duration or severity of the grade 1 or 2 complications could not quantify with precision, so they were recorded as present or absent.

Health care costs difference between both groups was calculated using only direct costs see [Table S2 in Supplementary material](#). We included costs for additional materials or drugs in the ERAS short stay protocol and not used in our control group (aprepitant, scopolamine patch, flexion pillow, skin glue for examples); costs of hospital care (each day on the orthopedic floor: 944 CAD, ambulatory surgery unit for day 0: 1384 CAD); costs of the physical therapy coordinator (3 h per ERAS short stay patient) and; costs related to the unexpected emergency (916.25 CAD) or outpatient clinic (124.50 CAD). Home care being exactly the same for both groups, so no specific cost was included regarding that matter. We did not include the treatment of each complication cost neither the potential economical benefits linked to a faster recovery in the ERAS short-stay group (time to return to work, for example).

5. Statistical analysis

Continuous variables are presented as mean, standard deviation (SD), minimum, and maximum, while categorical variables are presented using frequencies. Comparisons of the 2 groups of continuous data were analyzed using the Student-T tests. For comparisons of more than two groups, ANOVAs were performed. Categorical data was compared with a Chi-square. A significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-sided) was used for all tests. The analyses were performed using the SPSS software version 25. With an adverse event rate of 3.0 (SD 2.0) per patient, the estimated sample size needed to detect a reduction of 25% with 80% statistical power was 218 patients (109 in each group) with the alpha level set at 0.05.

This research project was approved by the Scientific and Ethics review board of Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital (#15044) and was registered on ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT03028779).

6. Results

In the ERAS short-stay group, 120 patients were recruited, of which 6 withdrew from the study before their surgery, leaving 114 patients. Patients' demographics and pre-existing conditions of the ERAS short-stay and the 150 controls are summarized in [Table 1](#). No significant differences were noted between the 2 groups except a lower mean age at surgery in the control group (54 versus 58, $p = 0.002$).

6.1. Complications

The rate of Grade 1 and Grade 2 complications according to the Clavien-Dindo classification was significantly lower in the short-stay group than in the control group (0.8 complications/patient versus 3.0 complications/patient, respectively, $p < 0.001$). No difference was found between the 2 groups in the rate of Grade 3 and Grade 4 complications per patient (0.03 versus 0.04 for the short-stay and control groups, respectively, $p = 0.5$). Grade 1 events were observed in 90% of patients in the control group compared to 49% in the ERAS short-stay group. Detailed description of each complication per grade can be found in [Table 2](#). The number of patients with 1 or multiple complications is described in [Table 3](#).

6.2. Failures, length of hospital stay and unexpected visits

Four THA (4%) and 3 TKA (14%) in the ERAS short-stay group failed to meet discharge criteria to leave the hospital the same day for THA or within the first 24 hours after surgery for TKA. The reasons for failure to discharge were due to dizziness ($n = 2$), urinary retention ($n = 1$), excessive wound discharge ($n = 1$) or orthostatic hypotension ($n = 4$). ERAS short-stay THA mean LOS was significantly shorter (0.1 day, SD 0.5, range 0–5) compared with the control group (2.9 days, SD 1.2, range 0–7) ($p < 0.001$). Similarly, mean LOS ERAS short-stay TKA was significantly shorter (0.95 day, SD 0.6, range 0–2) compared the control group (4.9 days, SD 1.4, range 3–8) ($p < 0.001$).

Visits to the ER occurred among 2 (1.1%) patients in the control group (both TKA; 1 for deep infection and 1 for pain) versus 3 (2.4%) in the ERAS short-stay group (all 3 THA; 1 inconsequential heartburn, discharged the same day; 1 vagal shock requiring ambulance, but inconsequential, discharged the same day; and 1 deep infection). Unexpected visits to the orthopedic clinic occurred among 13 (11%) patients in the ERAS short-stay group and 8 (5%) patients for the control group ($p = 0.07$). Reasons for consultations in the ERAS short-stay group were 3 stitch abscesses, 8 for the adjustment of pain medication, 1 for a wound dehiscence without infection and 1 for the appearance of a benign prominence at the level of the wound. In the control group, all consultations were for the adjustment of pain medication.

6.3. Direct health care costs

Direct costs (coordinator, materials and medications) related to the ERAS short-stay protocol were 215.38 CAD for THA and 326.52 CAD TKA in addition to the usual costs for these procedures (detailed calculation can be found in [Supplementary Materials, Table S2 and S3](#)). Comparing the expenses in the short-stay and control groups, the mean cost reduction for the ERAS short-stay group was 1489 CAD for THA and 4158 CAD for the TKA.

Table 1
Patient Demographics and pre-existing conditions.

Characteristics	Control (n = 150)	ERAS Short-Stay (n = 114)	p-value
Gender			0.3
Male	68 (45%)	59 (52%)	
Female	82 (55%)	55 (48%)	
Mean age ± SD, years (range)	54.3 ± 11.1 (22–71)	58.0 ± 9.8 (27–77)	0.002
Mean BMI ± SD, kg/m ² (range)	28.3 ± 4.6 (17.4–40.0)	27.5 ± 4.3 (14.5–38.3)	0.1
Type of surgery, n (%)			0.3
THA	115 (76.7)	93 (81.6)	
TKA	35 (23.3)	21 (18.4)	
ASA score, n (%)			0.3
1 (normal, healthy)	61 (40.7)	54 (47.4)	
2 (moderate systemic disease)	89 (59.3)	60 (52.6)	
Side operated, left:right			0.8
THA	50: 65 (43%: 57%)	42: 51 (45%: 55%)	
TKA	17: 18 (49%: 51%)	12: 9 (57%: 43%)	
Pre-existing conditions	n (%)	n (%)	
Arterial hypertension	37(25%)	32 (28%)	0.5
Asthma	16 (11%)	12 (11%)	1.0
Dyslipidemia	20(13%)	23(20%)	0.1
Type 2 diabetes	5 (3%)	9 (8%)	0.1
Sleep apnea	6(4%)	2 (2%)	0.5
Hypothyroidism	5 (3%)	10 (9%)	0.06
Migraine	3 (2%)	1 (0,9%)	0.6
Previous orthopedic surgery	53(35%)	40 (35%)	1.0
History of cancer	4 (3%)	5 (4%)	0.5
Spine injury with or without surgery	6 (4%)	10 (9%)	0.1
Heart disease	8 (5%)	10 (9%)	0.3
Renal disease	5 (3%)	3 (3%)	1.0
Urinary system impairment	3 (2%)	2 (2%)	1.0

SD: standard deviation from the mean.

Table 2
Complications rates per group according to Clavien-Dindo classification.

Complication	Control (n = 150)	ERAS short-stay (n = 114)	p-value
Grade 1			
Pain	67%	13%	< 0.001
Nausea	42%	12%	< 0.001
Vomiting	25%	1%	< 0.001
Dizziness	15%	4%	0.006
Headache	4%	0%	0.04
Constipation	8%	0%	0.002
Hypotension	26%	11%	0.003
Anemia (HB < 80)	8%	0%	0.002
Edema of the operated limb	9%	1%	0.005
Persistent lameness	4%	0	0.04
Ecchymosis	5%	0	0.011
Pruritic requiring medication	3%	0	0.072
Hematoma	3%	0	0.072
Fall without consequence	3%	5%	0.539
Grade 2			
Urinary retention	13%	4%	0.006
Anemia with transfusion	8%	0%	0.002
Deep vein thrombosis	3%	0	0.072
Stitch abscess	2%	0	0.261
Cellulitis	1%	1%	1.0
Sciatic nerve palsy (temporary)	1%	0	0.507
Grade 3			
Deep infection	0.7%	0.9%	1.0
Grade 4			
Severe respiratory depression	0.7%	0	1.0
Grade 5			
Death	–	–	

7. Discussion

Shorter hospital LOS after THA and TKA increases bed availability in a restricted environment and is favorable economically for the care provider. One attractive option to reduce hospital LOS is

to follow ERAS principles to optimize patient recovery, minimize the complications [28,29] and overall, to improve patient experience to a level where they will feel confident to return home earlier [8]. In our study, we showed that the implementation of our ERAS short-stay protocol was linked to a significant reduction in the complication rate by 50% (0.6 vs 1.2, $p < 0.001$) while achieving outpatient THA and < 24 h hospital LOS for TKA. Furthermore, our ERAS short stay program lowered direct health care costs compared to the standard inpatient procedure.

Our study presents limitations. This is a cohort study with a historical comparison group that can introduce a selection bias. However, by using the same inclusion/exclusion criteria in selecting patients, our two groups had similar patient characteristics, with no significant difference except for the short-stay group being older. In theory, being older would be a potentially negative factor for this group's results. The use of a retrospective cohort also implies that the search for efficacy measures such as adverse events was carried out from a file review and not prospectively as in the experimental cohort. It is likely that this minimized the number of real events. This, again, would have a negative impact on the results of the ERAS short-stay group. Another limitation is that the occurrence of perioperative complications was recorded, and not their frequency, intensity, or duration. However, this was done for both groups. Although there might be many different alternatives to the selected interventions in the study, the results of our study represent this unique combination. Specific weight effect of each measure cannot be determined or extrapolate from our data. We are linked to the results of a multimodal approach [30].

Our ERAS protocol was very efficient at reducing frequent patient's complication like pain, nausea, vomiting, dizziness, headache, constipation, hypotension, anemia, edema, lameness, and urinary retention ($p < 0.001$ –0.04). Many interventions differences may explain our improved results with the ERAS short-stay protocol versus our historical standard practice ([Supplementary material](#)

Table 3
Number of patients without complication or with multiple occurrences according to the Clavien-Dindo Classification.

Clavien-Dindo grade	Number of complications	Control group (n = 150)	Short-stay group (n = 114)	p-value
Grade 1	0	15 (10%)	58 (51%)	< 0.001
	< 3	60 (40%)	51 (45%)	
	3 to 5	63 (42%)	5 (4%)	
	> 5	12 (8%)	0 (0%)	
Grade 2	0	112 (75%)	107 (94%)	< 0.001
	< 3	37 (25%)	7 (6%)	
	3 to 5	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	
	> 5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Grade 3	0	147 (98%)	109 (96%)	0.3
	< 3	3 (2%)	5 (4%)	
	3 to 5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
	> 5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Grade 4	0	149 (99%)	114 (100%)	–
	< 3	1 (1%)	0 (0%)	
	3 to 5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
	> 5	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	
Grade 5	0	150 (100%)	114 (100%)	–

NB: if a patient had more than 1 event and in different categories, the events were counted individually.

S1). First, the important variations and the unsystematic approach of regular clinical practice involving multiple professionals may not provide the best treatment options for all patients. Secondly, our ERAS protocol was built with specific interventions aiming to prevent the most common post-operative complications. Of particular interest to us, were the complications of pain, nausea, and dizziness as these complications impact a patient's ability to be discharged [31–33]. The rates of these complications in our control group were similar to those reported by others [34–36] while the rates in the ERAS short-stay group were significantly lower.

7.1. Pain control

We believe the lower rate of pain control problem in the ERAS group may be attributed to the use of a multimodal approach including a pre-emptive medication cocktail, dexamethasone, an epidural-sedation anesthesia combination, LIA, and tourniquet avoidance for TKA. Minimizing opioids and sedatives is a protection to prevent dramatic event as the severe respiratory depression secondary to opioid overdose in the control group (grade 4 complication) which required a resuscitation intervention.

7.2. Gastro intestinal function

Multimodal approach including an improved pre-surgery feeding protocol [10], dexamethasone, aprepitant, scopolamine patch, opioids avoidance and early mobilization may explain the lower nausea, vomiting and constipation rates in the ERAS group.

7.3. Early ambulation motor function

Early function and mobilization are also key factors for success of a short stay program. Avoiding autonomic disturbance like orthostatic hypotension prolonged motor block linked to spinal anesthesia [37], quadriceps weakness linked to peripheral nerve blocks [38] and reducing knee hematoma formation by keeping the knee flexed in the postoperative period were also potentially helpful [24]. The combined epidural/sedation anesthesia technique used in our study with LIA avoid complete motor block. Patients can move their feet during the surgical procedure. When the deep sedation is ceased, patients can do lower limb mobilization in bed and soon stand and walk (2–3 hours after surgery) [18]. In addition, avoiding benzodiazepine use likely improved patient awareness and responsiveness.

7.4. Blood conservation

Pre-operative hemoglobin optimization, systemic tranexamic acid, careful hemostasis, keeping the TKA flexed 3 h postoperative, and adrenaline in the LIA helped minimizing blood loss and avoided the need for transfusion in our ERAS short-stay group [17,19]. Since postoperative hemoglobin level follow up is not easily accessible once at home, avoiding severe anemia is of primary importance when patients are sent home early after surgery.

7.5. Factor of success

To be effective, ERAS protocol should be applied systematically, and a team approach is essential. In most cases, it involves important practice modifications and following a common goal is the key. Moreover, it should simplify postoperative care as much as possible. One example is to favor oral anticoagulant instead of injected ones [39], which avoids the need for self-injection education. Second implementation is to improve wound management by using skin glue to seal the wound: reduced wound discharge, no dressing change needed, patient can shower, no staples to be removed and less superficial infection [40–42] but requires a subcuticular skin closure and 2–3 minutes of glue drying time.

7.6. Costs saving

According to Antoniou et al. [43], the estimated costs for hospitalization in Canada for a THA between 1997 and 2001 were approximately 6080 USD for an average LOS of 7.2 ± 4.7 days. The study concluded any reduction in the LOS would have a significant impact on the hospitalization costs for THA or TKA. In our study, the number of hospitalized days decreased by an average of 2.8 days for ERAS short-stay THAs and 3.9 days for the TKAs. The estimated cost reduction linked to the ERAS short-stay resulted in savings of 1489 CAD for THA and 4158 CAD for TKA. Applied broadly systematically, these savings would have a major impact for our hospital environment. The impact on indirect health care costs (time to return to work for example) remains to be evaluated, but nonetheless any reduction of the direct health care costs while insuring similar clinical outcomes is beneficial.

7.7. What is the goal?

In many recent short-stay studies and clinical practices, increasing bed availability by reducing LOS was the main motivating

factor [44,45]. Success for patients includes improved well-being, improved function, and reduced complication rate. Achieving outpatient surgery is a secondary objective of ERAS. As suggested by Vehmeijerfor et al., reducing hospital LOS “should not be a goal in itself, but should rather be the result of a successful, already implemented fast-track program based on the concept first better–then faster” [46]. A decreased LOS linked with increased readmission rate, re-operation rate and or post discharge spending would be non-desirable [1–3,47].

8. Conclusions

Our ERAS short-stay protocol for THA and TKA, improved patient outcome by reducing the adverse event rate by 50% compared to the standard procedure while achieving a hospital LOS below 24 h. In addition, this protocol was linked to a significant cost-by-case reduction for our institution. It is an all win situation.

Disclosure of interest

P-AV reports consultancy for Medacta, Microport, Stryker and Ethicon; grants from Medacta, Ethicon, Stryker and Zimmer; payment for lectures including service on speakers' bureaus from Medacta, and Stryker and Ethicon; royalties from Microport for Profemur and Preserve femoral stem; and payment for development of education presentations from Ethicon and Johnson and Johnson for Project Move, a day surgery program, all outside the submitted work.

VM reports consultancy for Zimmer; grants from Medacta, Ethicon, Stryker and Zimmer; payment for lectures including service on speakers' bureaus from Stryker and Zimmer, all outside the submitted work.

ML reports consultancy for Microport and Zimmer; grants from Medacta, Ethicon, Stryker and Zimmer; payment for lectures including service on speakers' bureaus from Zimmer; royalties from Microport for Profemur and Preserve femoral stem, all outside the submitted work.

Funding sources

This research received a specific unrestricted grant from the Maisonneuve-Rosemont Hospital Foundation.

Contributors

PAV, KP, LFF were involved in study design, data collection, data analyses and drafting of the manuscript. FD, VM, ML, CL, JF were involved in study design and reviewing of the draft manuscript. PAV was the senior author and responsible for the final manuscript version. All authors have approved the final article.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Richard Berger and Andrea Baldini for sharing their experience on ERAS short-stay THA and TKA, Angela Styhler and Dr. David Eichler for providing writing assistance in preparing this manuscript, Dr Marc-Olivier Kiss and Dr Alain Roy for performing surgery cases, and Nicolas Seca-Masot and Elena Naoumchik for their help in the economical evaluation.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otsr.2019.08.013>.

Références

- [1] Courtney PM, Froimson MI, Meneghini RM, Lee GC, Della Valle CJ. Can total knee arthroplasty be performed safely as an outpatient in the medicare population? *J Arthroplasty* 2018;33:28–31.
- [2] Toy PC, Fournier MN, Throckmorton TW, Mihalko WM. Low rates of adverse events following ambulatory outpatient total hip arthroplasty at a free-standing surgery center. *J Arthroplasty* 2018;33:46–50.
- [3] Weiser MC, Kim KY, Anoushiravani AA, Iorio R, Davidovitch RI. Outpatient total hip arthroplasty has minimal short-term complications with the use of institutional protocols. *J Arthroplasty* 2018;33:3502–7.
- [4] Cassard X, Garnault V, Corin B, Claverie D, Murgier J. Outpatient total knee arthroplasty: Readmission and complication rates on day 30 in 61 patients. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2018;104:967–70.
- [5] Darrith B, Frisch NB, Tetreault MW, Fice MP, Culvern CN, Della Valle CJ. Inpatient versus outpatient arthroplasty: A single-surgeon, matched cohort analysis of 90-day complications. *J Arthroplasty* 2019;34:221–7.
- [6] Dorr LD, Thomas DJ, Zhu J, Dastane M, Chao L, Long WT. Outpatient total hip arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 2010;25:501–6.
- [7] Goyal N, Chen AF, Padgett SE, Tan TL, Kheir MM, Hopper Jr RH, et al. Otto aufranc award: A multicenter, randomized study of outpatient versus inpatient total hip arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2017;475:364–72.
- [8] Kehlet H. Enhanced recovery after surgery (ERAS): Good for now, but what about the future? *Can J Anaesth* 2015;62:99–104.
- [9] Kehlet H, Slim K. The future of fast-track surgery. *Br J Surg* 2012;99:1025–6.
- [10] Crenshaw JT. Preoperative fasting: Will the evidence ever be put into practice? *Am J Nurs* 2011;111:38–43.
- [11] Min BW, Kim Y, Cho HM, Park KS, Yoon PW, Nho JH, et al. Perioperative pain management in total hip arthroplasty: Korean hip society guidelines. *Hip Pelvis* 2016;28:15–23.
- [12] Dalury DF. A state-of-the-art pain protocol for total knee replacement. *Arthroplasty Today* 2016;2:23–5.
- [13] Yue C, Wei R, Liu Y. Perioperative systemic steroid for rapid recovery in total knee and hip arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2017;12:100.
- [14] Li F, Ma J, Kuang M, Jiang X, Wang Y, Lu B, et al. The efficacy of pregabalin for the management of postoperative pain in primary total knee and hip arthroplasty: A meta-analysis. *J Orthop Surg Res* 2017;12:49.
- [15] Apfel CC, Zhang K, George E, Shi S, Jalota L, Hornuss C, et al. Transdermal scopolamine for the prevention of postoperative nausea and vomiting: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Ther* 2010;32:1987–2002.
- [16] Mathiesen O, Jacobsen LS, Holm HE, Randall S, Adamiec-Malmstroem L, Graungaard BK, et al. Pregabalin and dexamethasone for postoperative pain control: a randomized controlled study in hip arthroplasty. *Br J Anaesth* 2008;101:535–41.
- [17] Moskal JT, Capps SG. Meta-analysis of Intravenous Tranexamic Acid in Primary Total Hip Arthroplasty. *Orthopedics* 2016;39:883–92.
- [18] Saglik Y, Yazicioglu D, Cicekler O, Gumus H. Investigation of effects of epidural anaesthesia combined with general anaesthesia on the stress response in patients undergoing hip and knee arthroplasty. *Turk J Anaesthesiol Reanim* 2015;43:154–61.
- [19] Huang Z, Xie X, Li L, Huang Q, Ma J, Shen B, et al. Intravenous and topical tranexamic acid alone are superior to tourniquet use for primary total knee arthroplasty: A prospective, randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2017;99:2053–61.
- [20] Blakeney WG, Beaulieu Y, Puliero B, Lavigne M, Roy A, Masse V, et al. Excellent results of large-diameter ceramic-on-ceramic bearings in total hip arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J* 2018;1434–41.
- [21] Vendittoli PA, Makinen P, Drolet P, Lavigne M, Fallaha M, Guertin MC, et al. A multimodal analgesia protocol for total knee arthroplasty. A randomized, controlled study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2006;88:282–9.
- [22] Han Y, Yang W, Pan J, Zeng L, Liang G, Lin J, et al. The efficacy and safety of knotless barbed sutures in total joint arthroplasty: a meta-analysis of randomized-controlled trials. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2018;138:1335–45.
- [23] Congiusta D, Cushner F. A novel approach wound closure for total joint arthroplasty procedures. *Wound Care Management* 2018;1:1–5.
- [24] Jiang C, Lou J, Qian W, Ye C, Zhu S. Impact of flexion versus extension of knee position on outcomes after total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg* 2017;137:257–65.
- [25] Su EP, Perna M, Boettner F, Mayman DJ, Gerlinger T, Barsoum W, et al. A prospective, multi-center, randomised trial to evaluate the efficacy of a cryopneumatic device on total knee arthroplasty recovery. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2012;94:153–6.
- [26] Anderson DR, Dunbar M, Murnaghan J, Kahn SR, Gross P, Forsythe M, et al. Aspirin or Rivaroxaban for VTE Prophylaxis after Hip or Knee Arthroplasty. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378:699–707.
- [27] Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. *Ann Surg* 2004;240:205–13.
- [28] Soffin EM, YaDeau JT. Enhanced recovery after surgery for primary hip and knee arthroplasty: a review of the evidence. *Br J Anaesth* 2016;117:62–72.
- [29] Zhang H, Mao P, Wang C, Chen D, Xu Z, Shi D, et al. Incidence and risk factors of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) after total hip or knee arthroplasty: a retrospective study with routinely applied venography. *Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis* 2017;28:126–33.

- [30] Memtsoudis SG, Poeran J, Kehlet H. Enhanced Recovery After Surgery in the United States: From Evidence-Based Practice to Uncertain Science? *JAMA* 2019;321:1049–50.
- [31] Hoffmann JD, Kusnezov NA, Dunn JC, Zarkadis NJ, Goodman GP, Berger RA. The shift to same-day outpatient joint arthroplasty: A systematic review. *J Arthroplasty* 2018;33:1265–74.
- [32] Husted H, Lunn TH, Troelsen A, Gaarn-Larsen L, Kristensen BB, Kehlet H. Why still in hospital after fast-track hip and knee arthroplasty? *Acta Orthop* 2011;82:679–84.
- [33] Stowers MD, Lemanu DP, Coleman B, Hill AG, Munro JT. Review article: Perioperative care in enhanced recovery for total hip and knee arthroplasty. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong)* 2014;22:383–92.
- [34] Koren Knee Society (KKS). Guidelines for the management of postoperative pain after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Relat Res* 2012;24:201–7.
- [35] Parvataneni HK, Shah VP, Howard H, Cole N, Ranawat AS, Ranawat CS. Controlling pain after total hip and knee arthroplasty using a multimodal protocol with local periarticular injections: A prospective randomized study. *J Arthroplasty* 2007;22:33–8.
- [36] Salerno A, Hermann R. Efficacy and safety of steroid use for postoperative pain relief. Update and review of the medical literature. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2006;88:1361–72.
- [37] Kehlet H, Aasvang EK. Regional or general anesthesia for fast-track hip and knee replacement - what is the evidence?, 15; 2015. p. 4 [F1000Res, pii: F1000 Faculty Rev-1449].
- [38] Chaumeron A, Audy D, Drolet P, Lavigne M, Vendittoli PA. Periarticular injection in knee arthroplasty improves quadriceps function. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2013;471(7):2284–95.
- [39] Anderson DR, Dunbar M, Murnaghan J, Kahn SR, Gross P, Forsythe M, et al. Aspirin or rivaroxaban for VTE prophylaxis after hip or knee arthroplasty. *N Engl J Med* 2018;378(8):699–707.
- [40] Sutton N, Schmitz ND, Johnston SS. Economic and clinical comparison of 2-octyl cyanoacrylate/polymer mesh tape with skin staples in total knee replacement. *J Wound Care* 2018;27(Sup4):12–22.
- [41] Miller AG, Swank ML. Dermabond efficacy in total joint arthroplasty wounds. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ)* 2010;39(10):476–8.
- [42] Khan RJ, Fick D, Yao F, Tang K, Hurworth M, Nivbrant B, et al. A comparison of three methods of wound closure following arthroplasty: a prospective, randomised, controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2006;88(2): 238–42.
- [43] Antoniou J, Martineau PA, Filion KB, Haider S, Zukor DJ, Huk OL, et al. In-hospital cost of total hip arthroplasty in Canada and the United States. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 2004;86-A:2435–9.
- [44] Greer NL, Gunnar WP, Dahm P, Lee AE, MacDonald R, Shaikat A, et al. Enhanced Recovery Protocols for Adults Undergoing Colorectal Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Dis Colon Rectum* 2018;61: 1108–18.
- [45] Kehlet H, Joshi GP. Enhanced recovery after surgery: Current controversies and concerns. *Anesth Analg* 2017;125:2154–5.
- [46] Vehmeijer SBW, Husted H, Kehlet H. Outpatient total hip and knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop* 2018;89:141–4.
- [47] Bozic KJ, Ward L, Vail TP, Maze M. Bundled payments in total joint arthroplasty: Targeting opportunities for quality improvement and cost reduction. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2014;472:188–93.