anchor insertion into the inferior part of glenoid during arthroscopic labral surgery. The purpose of this study was to compare the clinical outcomes and radiological findings at the anchor site after arthroscopic Bankart repair with conventional biodegradable suture anchors and all-suture anchors.

**Material and Method:** A total of 67 patients were enrolled: 33 underwent surgery with an 1.3-mm (single loaded) or 1.8-mm (double loaded) all-suture anchor (Group A), and 34 underwent surgery with a 3.0-mm biodegradable anchor (10.8mm in length, 30% TCP/70% PLGA) (Group B). The inclusion criteria were patients with an isolated Bankart lesion in arthroscopic examination after anterior shoulder dislocation. Clinical outcomes, including the Rowe score, ASES score, return to preinjury sports level and redislocation rates were evaluated at 2 years after surgery. The degree of tunnel enlargement of the suture anchor insertion site was assessed with postoperative CT and CT arthrography at 1 year after operation according to the type and size of the suture anchor. To define the width of the tunnel, the greatest width of the hole along the suture anchor among the axial, sagittal, and oblique coronal planes was determined. Tunnel enlargement was calculated based on the difference between the width of the hole and the width of the suture anchor.

**Results:** Clinical outcomes did not differ significantly between groups A and B (ASES; Group A, 88.5 ± 12.3; Group B, 89.7 ± 10.9, P=0.667, Rowe score; Group A, 87.9 ± 14.9; Group B, 88.5 ± 14.6, P=0.857). The proportion of patients who returned to their preinjury level of sports at 2 years after operation was 81.8% in group A and 85.7% in group B. The postoperative redislocation occurred in two patients in group A (6.1%) and group B (5.9%. P=0.682), respectively. Total number of suture anchors inserted into the glenoid was significantly higher in group A (4.5 ± 0.9) than in group B (3.9 ± 0.5, P = 0.03). Average enlargement of the tunnel was significantly greater with the 1.8-mm all-suture anchor (2.8±0.9mm) than the 1.3-mm all-suture anchor (1.2±0.8mm) and 3.0-mm biodegradable anchor (0.8±1.2mm) (P<0.001). Enlargement of the tunnel was also significantly greater with the 1.3-mm all-suture anchor than the 3.0-mm biodegradable anchor (P < 0.01).

**Conclusion:** Despite of technical advantages of all-suture anchor insertion into the glenoid, the all-suture anchor demonstrated a significantly smaller load for 2 mm of labral displacement which is known to be associated with clinical fixation failure. However, an adequate application of upward force to a 6-kg weight deploy the all-suture anchor is regarded as an important factor to eliminate inferior fixation stability and early displacement. Despite concerns about the biomechanical results, our clinical outcomes of instability treatment with the all-suture anchor were equivalent to those of conventional biodegradable anchors. Arthroscopic Bankart repair with the all-suture anchor showed comparable clinical outcomes and postoperative stability compared to the biodegradable suture anchor at 2 years after surgery. Arthroscopic Bankart repair with the all-suture anchor showed comparable clinical outcomes and postoperative stability as the conventional biodegradable suture anchor at 2 years after surgery. Tunnel enlargement of the all-suture anchor was significantly greater than that of the biodegradable suture anchor at 1-year CT analysis. Although tunnel enlargement was greater with the all-suture anchor, it did not influence the clinical outcomes.

### Paper #5 EFFECT OF THE LOCATION OF THE SPLIT OF THE SUBSCAPULARIS ON RANGE OF MOTION, STABILITY, AND CONTACT PRESSURE IN THE GLENOHUMERAL JOINT FOLLOWING LATARJET OR TRILLAT PROCEDURES

***Geoffroy Nourissat, MD,*** *Clinique des Maussins, Paris, France*
*Alexander W. Hooke, MA, Andrew Thoreson, Kai-Nan An, PhD, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, Minnesota, USA*
*Jean-David Werthel, APHP, Paris, France*

**Background:** Biomechanical effects of the sling position in shoulder stabilizing repairs in not well understood. The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the Latarjet and Trillat procedures on the glenohumeral range of motion, joint stability, and contact pressure as evaluated in a cadaveric model.

**Methods:** 12 fresh-frozen cadaver shoulders were cleared of all soft tissues except for the rotator cuff muscles. The medial scapular body was removed and the remaining scapula was potted in resin such that the rim of the glenoid was parallel to the floor. Glenoid length and width were measured along the superior-inferior and anterior-posterior axes using a digital caliper. The humeral shaft was potted in resin in a hollow tube for fixation to the testing apparatus. The potted bones were then mounted onto a custom testing frame generating anterior humeral translation and joint compression in the medial direction. Each specimen was tested in five conditions: 1) intact shoulder, 2) 6-mm bony glenoid defect (20% defect) 3) Trillat procedure, 4) Latarjet procedure with subscapularis split at the junction between its superior 2/3rds and inferior 1/3rd, 5) Latarjet procedure with subscapularis split at the superior 1/3rds and inferior 2/3rds. A thin film pressure sensor (Tekscan), was placed through a portal created on the posterior of the capsule and centered in the joint space, held in place by the compressive forces applied. Internal and external axial ranges of motion were measured with the joint positioned in 0°, 30° and 60° of glenohumeral abduction (or approximately 30°, 60° and 90° of arm abduction relative to the trunk) measured using a custom protractor fixed to humeral shaft and uniaxial torque cell. The torque cell was rotated about the humerus' long axis until a 200 N-mm torque was reached to determine range of motion. Joint stability was assessed in each condition by rotating the humerus into the previously determined maximum axial internal and external rotation at glenohumeral abduction angles of 0°, 30° and 60°. 50-N of medial compression was applied, and loads of 20 N and 5 N were also applied to the subscapularis and conjoined tendon, respectively, to simulate the sling effect. Starting from a position at which the humeral head was seated at its most medial position on the glenoid, the humeral head was translated anteriorly for 10 mm at a rate of 2 mm/sec. Reaction forces, anterior displacement, and lateral humeral head displacement data were collected at a sample rate of 100 Hz. Glenohumeral contact area and peak pressure were recorded at the end range of internal and external rotation. The stability ratio was computed as the ratio of the anterior translational force to the compression force on the joint at maximum displacement at each condition. Means were compared with a full factorial repeated measures ANOVA with pairwise post hoc comparisons. A Bonferroni correction was applied to account for the multiple comparisons.

**Results:** Stability ratios were significantly lower with the glenoid defect compared to the intact and all repaired conditions at all levels of glenohumeral abduction, but the Trillat and Latarjet repair values were not significantly different from each other. Internal and external ranges of motion were not significantly different between any condition or glenohumeral angle. While there were no significant differences in contact area at the end range of internal or external rotation between any conditions or glenohumeral angles, peak pressure was significantly lower for the Trillat condition compared to the intact condition at full external rotation and 0° glenohumeral abduction. Peak external rotation pressures in the intact condition were also significantly lower at 30° and 60° glenohumeral abduction compared to 0° abduction. Also peak pressure in internal rotation pressure was significantly lower at 0° glenohumeral abduction compared to 60° abduction.

**Conclusions:** The location of the subscapularis muscle split in the Latarjet repair does not significantly impact range of internal external rotation, the contact mechanics at end points of this range, nor the stability. Latarjet and Trillat procedures appear to be comparable procedures in these respects as no significant differences in assessment parameters were observed.

### Paper #6 LATERALIZATION AND ATTACHMENT SITE AFFECT SUBSCAPULARIS BIOMECHANICS AFTER REVERSE SHOULDER ARTHROPLASTY

*Andreas Kontaxis, PhD, Eric Windsor, James J. Eno, MD, Xiang Chen, MS, David M. Dines, MD,* ***Lawrence Gulotta, MD,*** *Samuel A. Taylor, MD, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, NY, USA*




**Figure 1** (A) The NSM, (B) alternative SSc attachment points.

**Introduction:** Reverse shoulder arthroplasty (RSA) is a popular solution for irreparable rotator cuff tear and cuff tear arthropathy. However, there are still concerns about complications like limited range of motion, and stability. The repair of the subscapularis muscle (SSc) in RSA has been debated and recent clinical studies have showed that it can decrease shoulder function when used with lateralized glenospheres. However, it has been proposed that changing the repair SSc attachment site on the lesser tuberosity may achieve a better mechanical advantage and improve the function of the muscle. The purpose of this study was to investigate how i) RSA glenosphere lateralization and ii) SSc attachment site, can affect its biomechanics.




**Figure 2** Superior SSc attachment resulted in less adductive (-) moment arms compared to native or inferior insertion.

**Methods:** The Newcastle Shoulder Model (NSM) was used to calculate moment arms and muscle length of the SSc muscle before and after virtual RSA. The NSM consists of 6 rigid bones (thorax, clavicle, scapula, humerus, radius, and ulna) and the model simulates functional shoulder motions including clavicle and scapula kinematics (Fig1.A). The SSc muscle is modelled with 3 lines of action that simulate the superior, middle and inferior tendon bands. Nine CTs from healthy subjects were utilized to customize the NSM and create 9 individual models. Bony geometries were digitized, and the anatomic origins and insertions of the SSc were identified from an orthopedic surgeon. A virtual model of a commercially available RSA prosthesis (Comprehensive Reverse Shoulder, ZimmerBiomet) was implanted to each model. To study the effect of lateralization to the SSc biomechanics, three lateralized glenospheres (+0, +5 and +10 mm) were tested. Three attachment sites for SSc repair were also simulated for each model: the native, a superior, and an inferior attachment (Fig1.B). Muscle moment arms and lengths of the SSc were computed throughout simulations of abduction (0° to 150°), and internal rotation (0° to 80°) at 20° of abduction.

**Results:** Overall, RSA increased the adduction moment arm of the SSc compared to the anatomical shoulder (Fig2). Superior SSc attachment resulted in the least adductive moment arm (9.4±2.2mm compared to 15.1±2.8mm and 22.3±2.9mm for the native and inferior attachments respectively, p=0.002). The superior and native attachment had larger rotational moment arm compared to the inferior attachment, but it was smaller compared to the anatomical shoulder (p=0.003). Glenosphere lateralization did not affect the moment arm results (in abduction or in internal rotation, p=0.988), but it resulted in increased SSc length with maximum average length of




**Figure 3** Glenosphere lateralization can strain the SSc muscle longer than its maximum anatomical values creating passive tension.

139.4±8.4 for +0mm glenosphere, 143.9±8.4 mm for +5mm and 148.4±9.1mm for +10mm ($p<0.01$ for all pair comparisons, Fig.3). The inferior attachment also resulted in the significantly longer SSc length (143.9±8.3 mm, $p=0.001$).

**Discussion:** Lateralization of glenosphere had no effect on SSc moment arms in either abduction or internal rotation. However, it did increase the length of the muscle more than its anatomical length, which can create a passive tension. The latter in combination with the adductive moment arm of the SSc after RSA can counteract the deltoid and weaken shoulder strength. The results of the study suggest that a superior attachment site for SSc repair on RSA can improve SSc function, by decreasing its adductive action and shortening its length.

**Significance:** Excessive lateralization should be avoided when SSc is repaired in RSA. We also suggest a more superior attachment site than the native SSc insertion for improving its biomechanical function.

### Paper #7 OUTCOMES OF TOTAL SHOULDER ARTHROPLASTY FOR INSTABILITY ARTHROPATHY WITH A PRIOR CORACOID TRANSFER PROCEDURE: A RETROSPECTIVE REVIEW AND COMPARATIVE COHORT

***Michael J. Bender, MD***[a], *Brent J. Morris, MD*[a], *Mitzi S. Laughlin, PhD*[b], *Aydin Budeyri, MD*[c], *Ryan K. Le, B.S.*[d], *Hussein A. Elkousy, MD*[a], *T. Bradley Edwards, MD*[a], [a] *Texas Orthopedic Hospital, Department Orthopedic Surgery, Houston, Texas, USA;* [b] *University of Houston, Health and Human Performance, Houston, Texas, USA;* [c] *SANKO University Department of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, Gaziantep, Turkey;* [d] *Colorado State University, Greenwood Village, CO, USA*

**Introduction:** As coracoid transfers for shoulder instability become more prevalent, so will the eventual reconstructions for instability arthropathy that may develop. Concerns exist amongst surgeons regarding the difficulty and feasibility of performing anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty for instability arthropathy following these coracoid transfer procedures. Many question whether the loss of the coracoid and conjoined tendon as a landmark will increase the rate of complications, and if the splitting of the subscapularis compromises the muscle and thereby prohibits the use of an anatomic replacement or could lead to early failures.

**Goal:** The purpose of this study was to evaluate minimum 2 year outcomes following anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty for instability arthropathy with a prior coracoid transfer procedure and compare them to a matched cohort of patients following total shoulder arthroplasty for primary osteoarthritis.

**Methods:** A retrospective review was performed on a prospectively collected shoulder arthroplasty database from 2004-2018 by a single surgeon at a high-volume shoulder arthroplasty center. Patients with a diagnosis of instability arthropathy were identified and a chart review and radiographic review was performed to identify a subset of 14 patients with a prior coracoid transfer (Latarjet or Bristow procedure) that underwent subsequent anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty. 11 of the patients met criteria for minimum of 2 year clinical follow up, but 1 patient did not have his final follow up data as he was revised for deep infection to a different implant prior to the 2 year follow up of his index procedure. A matched cohort of patients was identified that underwent an anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty for primary osteoarthritis to serve as a comparative group. Cases were matched with 3 control subjects utilizing propensity scoring and matching according to age, gender, BMI and dominant shoulder with a nearest neighbor technique utilized for surgery date to account for changes in surgical technique over time. A matched linear, mixed model was used to test for differences between cases and matched controls for subject characteristics, ASES, and SANE scores. Chi-square tests were used to evaluate patient satisfaction.

**Results:** There were no significant differences between the coracoid transfer cohort and primary osteoarthritis cohort in regards to age (56.6 ± 4.4 vs 56.8 ± 5.1) gender (10M:1F vs 30M:3F), BMI (30.1 ± 5.6 vs 29.7 ± 4.6), shoulder dominance (6 [55%] vs 19 [58%]) or final follow up (49.5mo ± 31.2 vs 47.2 ± 27.5; $p=0.948$). The coracoid transfer cohort had significant improvement in ASES score (43 ± 20.0 to 94.4 ± 4.6; $p<0.001$), ASES pain score (20.0 ± 14.1 to 50.0 ± 0; $p<0.001$), SANE score (31.6 ± 19.6 to 94.4 ± 6.6; $p<0.001$), and patient satisfaction ($p<0.001$). The coracoid transfer cohort had statistically better final outcome scores than the primary osteoarthritis cohort in regards to ASES score (94.4±4.6 vs 82.2± 23.4; $p=0.018$), ASES pain score (50.0 ± 0 vs 40.6 ± 13.9; $p<0.001$), and SANE score (94.4 ± 6.6 vs 66.8 ± 34.5; $p=0.023$). However, these statistical differences in final outcome scores are likely not significant as the mean improvement from preoperative to postoperative scores were similar between cohorts as the primary osteoarthritis cohort had worse preoperative values (ASES score $p=0.373$, ASES pain score $p=0.683$, SANE score $p=0.076$). There was no significant difference in patient satisfaction between the cohorts at final follow up ($p=0.544$). The difference in revision rate (18.2% [2/11] vs 6.1% [2/33]) did not reach statistical significance ($p=0.545$).

**Conclusions:** At early to mid-term follow-up, anatomic total shoulder arthroplasty performed for instability arthropathy after a coracoid transfer demonstrated good results with significant improvements in all outcome measures. In this subset of patients, there appears to be equivalent results to total shoulder arthroplasty performed for primary osteoarthritis. Longer term follow up of these patients and larger patient cohorts will provide further insights into this problem and highlight any potential differences in outcomes or revision rate.

**TABLES**

**Subject Characteristics at Baseline**

| | Coracoid Transfers | Primary OA | p |
|---|---|---|---|
| Patients | 11 | 33 | |
| Age | 56.5 ± 4.4 | 56.8 ± 5.1 | 0.848 |
| Gender (M:F) | 30 : 3 | 10 : 1 | >0.99 |
| BMI | 30.1 ± 5.6 | 29.7 ± 4.6 | 0.822 |
| Dominant Shoulder | 6 (55%) | 19 (58%) | >0.99 |
| Follow Up (months) | 49.5 ± 31.2 | 47.2 ± 27.5 | 0.948 |

**Matched analysis**

| | Coracoid Transfers | | Primary OA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Preoperative | Postoperative | Preoperative | Postoperative |
| ASES | 43.1 ± 20.0 | 94.4 ± 4.6 | 36.3 ± 15.6 | 82.2 ± 23.4 |
| ASES – Pain | 20.0 ± 14.1 | 50.0 ± 0 | 8.4 ± 5.9 | 40.6 ± 13.9 |
| SANE | 31.6 ± 19.6 | 94.4 ± 6.6 | 28.2 ± 23.2 | 66.8 ± 34.5 |

| | Preop to final FU differences | CCTF vs control differences | Pre/ postGroup |
|---|---|---|---|
| | p | p | p |
| ASES | <0.001 | 0.018 | 0.373 |
| ASES – Pain | <0.001 | <0.001 | 0.683 |
| SANE | <0.001 | 0.023 | 0.076 |