## Copyright O by The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, Incorporated Young et al.

COMPARISON OF FUNCTIONAL OUTCOMES OF REVERSE SHOULDER ARTHROPLASTY WITH THOSE OF HEMIARTHROPLASTY IN THE TREATMENT OF CUFF-TEAR ARTHROPATHY... http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.L.00302

Page 1 of 2

		Reverse Shoulder	
	Hemiarthroplasties* ( $N = 102$ )	Arthroplasties* ( $N = 102$ )	P Value
Age† (yr)	71.6 (51-88)	72.6 (49-88)	0.38
Men	51	51	1
Women	51	51	1
Left	46	41	0.57
Right	56	61	0.57
Bilateral	4	1	0.37
Previous surgery			
None	72	72	1
Cuff repair	18	26	0.23
Acromioplasty alone	5	2	0.41
Stabilization	3	2	1
Unknown procedure	4	0	0.12
Approach			
Deltopectoral	95	87	0.11
Superior	7	15	0.11
Duration of operation (incision to closure)† (min)	85 (35-270)	112 (62-172)	< 0.0001
Cement			
Humerus	28	8	< 0.01
Glenoid	0	1	1
ASA score†	2.3 (1-3)	2.2 (1-3)	0.56
Follow-up† (mo)	81 (35-139)	57 (35-90)	< 0.01

TABLE E-1 Demographic Data

\*The values are given as the number of shoulders unless otherwise indicated. †The values are given as the mean with the range in parentheses.

## Copyright $\textcircled{\mbox{\scriptsize obs}}$ by The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, Incorporated Young et al.

 $Comparison of Functional Outcomes of Reverse Shoulder Arthroplasty with Those of Hemiarthroplasty in the Treatment of Cuff-Tear Arthropathy... \\ http://dx.doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.L.00302$ 

Page 2 of 2

					Duration of			
				Mean Age	Follow-up			
Authors	Year	Prosthesis	No.	(yr)	(mo)	Satisfied (%)	Score <sup>†</sup>	Reoperation
Arntz et al. <sup>4</sup>	1993	Neer II	18	71	3 (2-10)	Not stated	Not stated	4/18
Williams and Rockwood <sup>5</sup>	1996	Neer II	21	72	4 (2-6.6)	86*	Not stated	0/21
Field et al. <sup>34</sup>	1997	Not stated	16	74	3 (2-5)	63*	Not stated	2/16
Zuckerman et al. <sup>31</sup>	2000	Neer II/Cofield	15	73	2 (1-5)	87	Not stated	Not stated
Sanchez-Sotelo et al. <sup>10</sup>	2001	Cofield	33	69	5 (2-11)	67*	Not stated	2/33
Sarris et al. <sup>11</sup>	2003	Bipolar	14	71	29 (24-48)		80 (ASES)	Not stated
Visotsky et al. <sup>12</sup>	2004	Global Advantage CTA	60	70.4	32 (24-not stated)	89*	79 (ASES)	Not stated
Goldberg et al. <sup>9</sup>	2008	Not stated	34	72	3.7 (2-12)	76*	67 (ASES)	1/34
Berth and Pap <sup>8</sup>	2008	Bipolar and Aequalis	41	67	35 (20-56)		56 (Constant)	0/41

## TABLE E-2 Published Results of Hemiarthroplasty for Cuff-Tear Arthropathy

\*According to "limited-goals criteria" of Neer. †ASES = American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons.

TABLE E-3 Published Results of Reverse Shoulder Arthroplasty for Cuff-Tear Arthrop	pathy
--	-------

Authors	Veen	Dreathagia	No	Mean Age	Diagnosas*	Duration of	Satisfied (0/)	Saamat	<b>D</b> ecomposition $(\theta_{i})$
Authors	rear	Prostnesis	INO.	(yr)	Diagnoses*	Follow-up ( <i>mo</i> )	Satisfied (%)	Score	Reoperation (%)
De Buttet et al. <sup>35</sup>	1997	Delta III	71	Not stated	1	24	Not stated	69 (Constant)	4
Valenti et al. <sup>36</sup>	2001	Delta III	39	70	1,4	84	Not stated	63 (Constant)	15
Sirveaux et al. <sup>37</sup>	2004	Delta III	80	73	1	44.5	Not stated	65.5 (Constant)	5
Werner et al. <sup>38</sup>	2005	Delta III	58	68	1,4	38	Not stated	64 (Constant)	33
Frankle et al. <sup>30</sup>	2005	RSP*	60	71	1, 2, 6	33	95	68.2 (ASES)	15
Boileau et al. <sup>6</sup>	2006	Delta III	45	72	1, 3, 4	40	78	59 (Constant)	13
Wall et al. <sup>22</sup>	2007	Delta/Aequalis	84	73	1	40	96	65.1 (Constant)	Not stated
Young et al. <sup>39</sup>	2009	SMR Reverse	49	79	1, 2, 3, 4, 6	33	89	70.1 (ASES)	0
Favard et al.40	2011	Delta/Aequalis	148	73	1	90	Not stated	61.5 (Constant)	Not stated

\*Diagnoses: 1 = rotator cuff tear arthropathy/osteoarthritis with cuff tear, 2 = posttraumatic arthropathy, 3 = fracture and fracture sequelae, 4 = failed hemiarthroplasty or total shoulder arthroplasty, 5 = tumor on the proximal part of the humerus, and 6 = rheumatoid arthritis.  $\dagger ASES = American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons.$