Simultaneous versus Staged Bilateral Total Hip Arthroplasty – A Matched Cohort Analysis of Revenue and Contribution Margin

Vinaya Rajahraman¹, Itay Ashkenazi, Jeremiah Joseph Thomas, Alana Marie Prinos, Muhammad A Haider, Joseph A Bosco², Roy Davidovitch³, Ran Schwarzkopf⁴

¹NYU Langone, ²NYU Hospital For Joint Diseases, ³NYU Langone Orthopedic Surgery, ⁴NYU Langone Orthopedic Hospital, Hospital For Joi

INTRODUCTION:

Though previous studies have demonstrated improved cost benefits associated with simultaneous vs. staged bilateral total hip arthroplasty (simBTHA and staBTHA), further investigation is needed regarding revenues and contribution margins (CM) of these procedures. In this study, we compared revenue, CM, and surgical outcomes between simBTHA and staBTHA.

METHODS: All patients who underwent simBTHA (both procedures completed the same day) and staBTHA (procedures completed on different days within one year) between 2011 and 2021 at a single high-volume orthopaedic specialty hospital were identified. Of the 1,517 identified patients (n=139 simBTHA, n=1,378 staBTHA), 232 were included in a 1:1 propensity match based on baseline demographics (116 per cohort). Revenue, costs, CM, and surgical outcomes were compared between cohorts.

RESULTS: SimBTHA procedures had significantly lower total costs (p<0.001), direct costs (p<0.001), and patient revenue (p=0.036) than staBTHA procedures. There was no significant difference in CM between groups (p=0.361). Additionally, there were no significant differences in length of stay (p=0.173), operative time (p=0.438), 90-day readmissions (p=0.701), 90-day revisions (p=0.313), or all-cause revisions (p=0.701) between cohorts.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION:

Though simBTHA procedures have lower revenues than staBTHA, they also have lower costs resulting in similar CM between procedures. As both procedures have similar postoperative complication rates, further research is required to evaluate specifically which patients may benefit from simBTHA versus staBTHA regarding clinical and patient-reported outcomes.

| | simBTHA (%) (n=139) | staBTHA (%) (n=1,378) | p-value |
|------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 85 (61.2) | 564 (40.9) | < 0.001* |
| Female | 54 (38.8) | 814 (59.1) | |
| Mean Age (range) | 53.8 (25 to 74) | 61.3 (16 to 91) | < 0.0014 |
| Race | | | |
| White | 95 (68.3) | 1012 (73.4) | 0.386 |
| African American | 20 (14.4) | 189 (13.7) | |
| Asian | 3 (2.2) | 33 (2.4) | |
| Other | 21 (15.1) | 144 (10.4) | |
| Smoking Status | | | |
| Current | 17 (12.3) | 117 (8.7) | 0.325 |
| Former | 50 (36.2) | 537 (39.9) | |
| Never | 71 (51.4) | 693 (51.4) | |
| Insurance Status | | | |
| Medicare | 16 (11.5) | 539 (39.1) | < 0.0014 |
| Medicaid | 11 (7.9) | 131 (9.5) | |
| Private | 110 (79.1) | 694 (50.4) | |
| Workers' Comp | 2(1.4) | 14 (1.0) | |
| ASA | | | |
| 1 | 18 (12.9) | 90 (6.6) | < 0.0014 |
| 2 | 114 (82.0) | 917 (66.9) | |
| 3 | 7 (5.0) | 355 (25.9) | |
| 4 | 0 (0,0) | 9 (0.7) | |
| Mean BMI (range) | 27.4 (17.6 to 40.9) | 29.2 (15.6 to 51.6) | < 0.0014 |
| | 1.3 (1.2) | 2.3 (2.0) | < 0.0014 |

| 4 (%) p-valu |
|--------------|
| |
| 0.036 |
| 2000 |
| 76) 0.373 |
| |
| 0.989 |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 0.849 |
| |
| |
| |
| 0.150 |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| 0.697 |
| |
| |
| |
| 44.5) 0.277 |
| 0.302 |
| 0.1) 0.565 |
| |

| Revenue, Cost, Contribution | | Table 4. Clinical Outcomes for Matched Groups | | | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------|
| | Simultaneous (n=116) vs. Staged THA (n=116) | p-value | | simBTHA (%) | staBTHA (%) | p-valu |
| Revenue | -10.5% [-20.4, -0.7] | 0.036* | | (n=116) | (n=116) | - |
| reace, [95% CI]) | | | Mean LOS (days, range) | 3.4 (0.8 to 10.0) | 3.8 (0.3 to 16.5) | 0.173 |
| ost | -20.8% [-27.0%, -14.6] | <0.001* | Mean Operative Time (min, range) | 180.3 (97 to 318) | 183.5 (73 to 466) | 0.438 |
| rence, [95% CI]) | | | 30-Day Readmissions | 3 (2.6) | 3 (2.6) | 1.000 |
| ost | -18.5% [-24.6, -12.3] | <0.001* | 90-Day Readmissions | 3 (2.6) | 4 (3.4) | 0.701 |
| rence, [95% CI]) | | | Superficial SSI | 0 (0,0) | 1 (0.9) | 0.316 |
| ution Margin | -6.8% [-21.6, +7.9%] | 0.361 | PJI | 1 (0.9) | 1 (0.9) | 1.000 |
| rence, [95% CI]) | , | | Periprosthetic fracture | 2 (1.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0.156 |
| | CL confidence interval | | Non-orthopaedic | 0 (0.0) | 2(1.7) | 0.156 |
| < 0.05 | | | 90-day VTEs | 0 (0.0) | 0 (0.0) | 1.000 |
| . 0.02 | | | 90-day Revisions | 3 (2.6) | 1 (0.9) | 0.313 |
| | | | PII | 1 (0.9) | 1 (0.9) | 1.000 |
| | | | Periprosthetic fracture | 2(1.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0.156 |
| | | | All Cause Revisions | 4 (3.4) | 3 (2.6) | 0.701 |
| | | | PJI | 1 (0.9) | 2 (1.7) | 0.561 |
| | | | Periprosthetic fracture | 2 (1.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0.156 |
| | | | Aseptic Loosening | 1 (0.9) | 1 (0.9) | 1.000 |
| | | | Type of Revision Procedure | | 1.(4.1.) | + |
| | | | DAIR | 1 (25.0) | 2 (66.7) | 0.270 |
| | | | | 3 (75.0) | 1 (33.3) | |