Case Report

Persistently High Hip Circumference after Bariatric Surgery Is a Major Hurdle to Successful Hip Replacement
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1. Introduction

According to NHANES 2009-2010, the prevalence of class III obesity (BMI ≥ 40 kg/m²) in black, white, Hispanic, and Mexican American women is 18.0%, 7.3%, 6.1%, and 6.7%, respectively [1]. For men, the prevalence also varies by ethnicity but is lower than 8% in all groups [1]. Due to their high rate of obesity, black women are highly likely to come to the attention of orthopedic surgeons after bariatric surgery for hip replacement. Bariatric surgery is associated with many benefits including the eradication or improvement of hyperglycemia, hypertension, dyslipidemia, hepatic steatosis, and obstructive sleep apnea [2]. All of these metabolic changes lead to decreased risk of anesthesia and postsurgical metabolic complications. But in our urban orthopedic clinic, we are observing persistently high hip circumferences in black women, even after major weight loss (MMM). Therefore we frequently encounter an unpublished and unexpected orthopedic risk: inadequate loss of subcutaneous fat in the operative field. To demonstrate the challenges, a representative case is presented.

2. Case

With the expectation that her back and hip pain would resolve, a 51-year-old black woman, with a BMI of 52.0 kg/m², underwent laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass. Within three years she achieved a BMI of 33.7 kg/m². At this lower BMI, she reported that her back pain had improved but due to persistent severe right hip pain, her ability to ambulate remained compromised. She requested surgical relief.

At her preoperative orthopedic evaluation, she had a Harris Hip Score of 17, and even though her BMI was 33.7 kg/m², her hip circumference was proportionately much higher. Preoperative photographs of her with a BMI of 33.7 kg/m² were not taken. Photographs from 3 years later when her BMI
had increased to 42.0 kg/m$^2$ have been obtained (Figure 1). At the time these photographs were taken, her waist and hip circumferences were 107 cm and 155 cm, respectively. Her overall proportions with a BMI of 42.0 kg/m$^2$ were visually similar to her preorthopedic surgery measurements when her BMI was 33.7 kg/m$^2$.

Due to her high hip circumference, minimally invasive techniques were not an option. The massive soft tissue mass in the surgical field totally obstructed bony landmarks and precluded both computer and image navigation techniques. She underwent a 4-hour operation during which extensile incisions were utilized to improve access and component positioning. Due to the 15 cm depth of the soft tissue tunnel, combined with the inability to reflect the soft tissue flaps, a traditional cup placement could not be achieved. Therefore, instead of the more optimal total hip replacement, a hemiarthroplasty was performed. Postoperatively, a chronically draining wound which took months to stabilize occurred.

Nonetheless she had transient improvement in hip score. However, her ambulation at 1 and 3 years after hemiarthroplasty was only minimally improved and she is categorized as housebound ambulatory with a Harris Hip Score of 18.

### 3. Discussion

For the woman presented, bariatric surgery was successful in achieving weight loss so that BMI declined from 52.0 kg/m$^2$ to 33.7 kg/m$^2$. However, her persistently high hip circumference left her with the same technical challenges during hip replacement surgery as if she had not undergone the weight loss intervention. Even with a BMI in the category of class I obese, her body fat distribution was such that a total hip replacement could not be accomplished. Due to the size, shape, and mobility of the soft tissues in the operative field, adequate exposure and access to the acetabular component were not achievable.

This case raises awareness that neither absolute weight nor BMI is sufficient to define whether the subsequent orthopedic risks have been minimized. Attention needs to be paid to the mass of fat in the operative field. Importantly, this large mass of subcutaneous fat can be predicted preoperatively by simply measuring hip circumference and performing hip axial imaging by CT (Figure 2). Consistent with our clinical experience, the importance of hip circumference as a way to predict high body fat content has recently been validated. The ratio of hip circumference to height known as the Body Adiposity Index (BAI), has been shown to be superior to BMI as a measure of body fat [3] (Body Adiposity Index = (hip circumference/(height$^{1.5}$)) − 18).

Overall, this case presentation has special relevance for black women. Women have more subcutaneous fat than men and black women have more subcutaneous fat than white women [4, 5]. Therefore even after successful weight loss black women are likely to continue to have a relatively high volume of subcutaneous fat. To optimize orthopedic outcomes related to total hip replacement, surgeons need to evaluate patients independent of BMI for this possibility and plan accordingly. At this time, bariatric and orthopedic surgeons focus on BMI rather than hip circumference.

We bring this issue forth because there appears to be an absence of appreciation of this issue. A literature search led us to the identification of only two articles discussing hip replacement surgery following bariatric surgery [6, 7]. Both of these articles described the benefits of bariatric surgery and neither addressed the orthopedic issues we describe. Because extensive fat in the surgical field is so commonly encountered in our practice, we have developed modifications that have been helpful (MMM) (Table 1). We appreciate the limitations in waist and hip circumference measurements being made 3 years following her hip replacement surgery. However her body mass distribution, including her pear shaped body habitus, was preserved allowing for some of the observations and
Figure 2: CT imaging to demonstrate soft tissue geometry and gravitational changes with position. (a) Axial supine. (b) Lateral decubitus. These scans are presented as an example and are from a black woman with BMI of 45.0 kg/m².

Table 1: Modifications to consider for hip arthroplasty with high hip circumference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Standard procedure</th>
<th>Modifications to consider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative workup</td>
<td>Hip and pelvis radiographs</td>
<td>Waist and hip circumferences*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preoperative range of motion/ flexibility assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Axial supine and lateral decubitus CT (Figure 2 is presented as an example)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule for oversized 1000-pound table, lateral positioners, oversize instruments, and retractors, and additional staff and operating time and resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preoperative setup in surgical suite</td>
<td>“Bean bag” with usual time and staffing</td>
<td>Anterolateral approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position on operative table</td>
<td>Approach as per surgeon’s preference</td>
<td>Intraoperative direct measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of tunnel depth</td>
<td>Direct inspection</td>
<td>Improved illumination and retraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visualization</td>
<td>Direct inspection</td>
<td>Supplemental headlamps, flashlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illumination</td>
<td>Quartz halogen, LED, focused high intensity lighting</td>
<td>Oversized “Charnleys,” Burkhalters, and Beckman’s oversized angled retractors and oversized instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue exposure</td>
<td>“Charnley,” Weitlander, angled, and reverse retractors</td>
<td>Accommodation for hard immobile adipose tissues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue compression</td>
<td>Careful soft tissue handling</td>
<td>Broad retractor blades, wider exposure, releasing tension in intervals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue reflection</td>
<td>Careful soft tissue handling</td>
<td>Accommodation for hard immobile adipose tissues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivering the femur</td>
<td>One surgical assistant</td>
<td>Multiple surgical assistants and soft tissue releases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment</td>
<td>Guidance rods and skeletal landmarks</td>
<td>More deliberate use of “bone hooks,” retractors, and computer assisted guides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


recommendations we have made. We hope this case presentation will lead to improved outcomes and bring attention to the need to focus not just on BMI but also hip circumference when considering the options for hip arthroplasty.
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