

Functional Outcome of Total Knee Replacement with Medial Parapatellar and Subvastus Approach: A Comparative Study

Naveen Rathor¹, Suresh Kumar Bhatnagar², Saurabh Agrawal³

¹Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, American International Institute of Medical Science, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

²Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, American International Institute of Medical Science, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

³Associate Professor, Department of Orthopedics, American International Institute of Medical Science, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Naveen Rathor

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijshr.20250407>

ABSTRACT

Background & objectives: The purpose of this study was to determine differences in clinical outcome between subvastus and medial parapatellar approach in primary total knee arthroplasty. **Methods:** This is a prospective randomized study; we compared the clinical results of primary total knee arthroplasty using Subvastus and medial Parapatellar approaches in 80 patients. Patients are equally divided into both groups. Clinical outcome assessed using knee society score, time to return quadriceps function and visual analogue scale for pain.

Results: The mean follow-up time was 3 months. Pain improved significantly overtime in both groups. However, when comparing groups together, patients in subvastus group had better numerical visual analogue scale score at 3rd day postoperatively, nevertheless, no significant differences found at other follow up times (8.17, 5.98, 4.37, 2.84, 1.56 for medial parapatellar group and 8.23, 4.16, 4.0, 1.86, 1.17 for subvastus group at preoperative, 3rd day, 2, 6 and 12 weeks postoperative respectively for both groups). Subvastus group had earlier return of quadriceps function which was significant statistically.

Knee society score improved significantly overtime without any significant differences when comparing both groups together at any time of the follow up periods.

Conclusions: Subvastus approach allowed earlier return of quadriceps function and less pain in the early postoperative day. In long term of functional outcome, none of two surgical approaches showed advantage over the other.

Keywords: Total knee arthroplasty, Knee society score, medial parapatellar, subvastus

INTRODUCTION

Medial parapatellar (MPP) and subvastus approaches are two commonly performed surgical approaches in primary total knee arthroplasty (TKA). The MPP approach is considered the standard technique with good surgical exposure. It allows incision to medial side of patella through quadriceps tendon. With MPP approach, there is concern about vascularity of patella which may lead to subsequent patellar necrosis that can cause anterior knee pain and patellar fracture¹⁻³. Subvastus approach is a “quadriceps-sparing” technique, in which extensor mechanism left intact. It may allow earlier return of knee function and decrease

disruption of patellar vascularity. However, the limitation of this approach includes limited surgical exposure that can cause technical difficulty, especially in obese patients^{1, 4-7}. Previously, many studies had compared short- and long-term outcomes of each surgical approach with conflicting results. It has been shown that the SV approach has quicker rehabilitation due to preserving quadriceps tendon, however, the ultimate long-term outcomes were similar between both approaches^{6, 8-11}. The goal of this prospective study was to compare two consecutive groups of patients undergoing primary TKA in term of clinical results. The first group with a medial parapatellar approach and the second group with a subvastus approach.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This prospective randomized comparative study was conducted in American International institute of medical science, on patients who underwent primary TKA surgery with two different surgical approaches, medial parapatellar and subvastus for advanced knee osteoarthritis. eighty patients were involved in the study, operated between the april 2024 to November 2024. This study was approved by the institutional ethics committee of and written informed consent was obtained from each participant. The established inclusion criteria included osteoarthritis with severe pain and functional disability with documented failure of conservative management. The exclusion criteria comprised patients with revision TKA, previous ipsilateral knee surgery (e.g. patellectomy, osteotomies around knee and open meniscus procedure), Varus deformity greater than 20 degrees, fixed flexion deformity more than 25 degrees, age over 80 years, cognitive impairment, body mass index more than 35 kg/m², rheumatoid arthritis, neuromuscular conditions, and ligamentous deficiency that need constrained knee prosthesis. Patients were randomly and equally divided in to both groups. All patients underwent primary

TKA by single surgeon who had been in practice for over 10 years. A research investigator collected all data prospectively. In order to assess the functional outcome of the knee after TKA, the following measurements were taken just prior to surgery and postoperatively at 2, 6 and 12 weeks. The Knee Society Score¹² (KSS) consisted of knee score (severity of pain, range of motion, flexion contracture and stability of the knee) and function score (functional capacity during walking and climbing stairs with or without walking aid) were used to assess clinical outcome of the knee. Also, Visual analogue scale (VAS) score was used to rate pain¹³. Lastly, patients were tested for returning of quadriceps function by their ability to do active straight leg raise test (SLRT). All patients received a general or spinal anesthesia, cemented cruciate-substituting design (Meril Hi flex knee system) were used in all cases without patellar replacement. Midline skin incision centered on patella followed by either medial parapatellar arthrotomy as described by Campbell¹⁴ or medial subvastus arthrotomy as described by Hoffmann¹⁵. An intramedullary guide system on femoral side and an extramedullary guide on the tibial side were used. Proper soft tissue balance checked with trial implants. After confirming knee stability with equal gaps, definitive implants were cemented in position and wound closed in multiple layers without using drain. Postoperative follow up included the same protocol for pain control and early physiotherapy that started 24 hours after operation with passive and active exercises. Descriptive approach “for calculation of frequencies, percentages, mean and standard deviation, constructing tables and diagrams” Analytical approach “for finding associations between variables by finding P-value using chi square test, t-test, ANOVA.

RESULTS

The study included 80 patients randomized to undergo primary total knee arthroplasty

with use one of the two techniques. All patients were available throughout the entire

testing period. Preoperative demographic characteristics are presented in Table (1).

Table (1): Demographic characteristics

Characteristic	MPPA Group	SVA Group
Age (mean)	63.89	65.72
BMI (Mean)	27.83	28.74
Male: female	9:31	7:29

Knee society score for Knee score were significantly improved at all different follow-up periods (2, 6 and 12 weeks) in comparison to baseline preoperative score in

the same group. Nevertheless, no statistically significant differences observed when comparing both groups together at any time of the follow up periods table (2).

Table (2): knee society score-knee score

Knee score (mean ± SD)	MPPA Group	SVA Group	P-value
Pre-op	41.89±10.89	37.26±11.48	
2 weeks	62.87±8.48	58.79±7.23	0.059
6 weeks	71.83±7.14	69.23±6.54	0.057
12 weeks	76.82±8.61	73.08±5.84	0.087

Knee society score for function was improved significantly with time in the same group when compared to the baseline score. On the other hand, Comparison

between both groups revealed no significant differences at any time of follow-up periods, Table (3).

Table (3): knee society score for function

Knee society score –knee function (Mean ±SD)	MPPA Group	SVA Group	p-value
PRE-OP	21.34±16.82	27.64±12.64	
2 WEEK POST-OP	40.08±12.16	47.34±14.48	0.712
6 WEEK POST-OP	62.18±8.39	68.0±10.08	0.839
12 WEEK POST-OP	72.13±7.62	74.52±7.86	0.725

Time to return quadriceps function (TRQF) was assessed by ability of patients to actively raise straight leg (MPP: 3.80±0.73 days vs. SV: 2.64±0.57days, p=0.001). SV group had earlier return of quadriceps function by 1.16 days which was significant statistically. The VAS to rate pain preoperatively was 8.17 for MPP group and 8.23 for SV group. Pain improved significantly at all different follow-up times when compared to the preoperative rate of pain in the same group (5.98, 4.37, 2.84, 1.56 for MPP group and 4.16, 4.0, 1.86, 1.17 for SV group at 3rd day, 2, 6 and 12 weeks postoperative respectively). When comparing both groups together, no statistically significant differences found at 2, 6, and 12 weeks. However, differences were significant at postoperative day three

of the follow up period, in favor of SV group (p= 0.001).

DISCUSSION

Subvastus and MPP are the main surgical approaches used for primary TKA with many arguments on which approach results in better functional outcome in last 2 decades. This has stimulated us to conduct a study to compare functional outcome of 2 approaches. One of the measures to evaluate clinical outcome was knee society score which consists of the Knee score and functional score. Comparison of improvement in knee score between both groups displayed slightly better score in favor of SVA group, this difference was not significant statistically at any periods of the follow up. Similar observations found in

other studies^{10, 16-18}. In contrast, meta-analysis of 9 randomized control trial by Peng et al⁶ found better KSS in SV approach at 3 months and 2 years but no differences at 4-6 weeks. Similarly, they found better ROM at 1 week and 1 year, on the other hand, they found better VAS score at 1 week and 6 months follow up in Subvastus group. These decreases in postoperative pain and increases in ROM had resulted in better knee score in their study. In our study we found no differences in pain and ROM at 2, 6 and 12 weeks. Hence, no differences in KSS could be found in our patients. Moreover, we followed patients for 12 weeks only and we need more follow up time to evaluate long term result. The knee function score which assessed overall function of the knee demonstrated no statistically significant differences when two groups compared together at any time of follow-up. These findings correlate with the observations of other studies¹⁹⁻²¹, whom failed to show significant differences between two approaches in function score.

In contrast, Teng et al²² in a meta-analysis of 9 studies showed that SVA provided better function score at 1 month follow up. They correlate this finding via reducing the skin incision, preserving the vastus medialis insertion, and avoiding patellar eversion in Subvastus group. In our study, vastus medialis preservation resulted in less pain in early postoperative days and quicker return of quadriceps function. However, differences in pain were temporary and disappeared within 2 weeks and have not affected the knee function. Returning quadriceps function delayed in MPP group by 1.46 days, at 2 weeks follow up, all patients were able to do active straight leg raise test in both groups. Hence, it was not affected knee function. Time to return quadriceps function (TRQF) performed by ability of patients to do active straight leg raise test (SLRT). We found shorter time to return quadriceps function in SV group by 1.16 days (MPP: 3.80 ± 0.73 vs. SV: 2.64 ± 0.57 , $p = 0.001$). This observation

shows a well relationship with other studies^{10,17,18, 23}, whom showed earlier return of quadriceps function that were significant statistically. This earlier return of SLR explained by preservation of vastus medialis as a part of quadriceps mechanism or may be related to pain that limit quadriceps function, because patients in MPP have more pain than SV at 3rd postoperative day as shown by VAS. Despite these differences, earlier SLR did not result in significantly better outcomes on the KSS because pain was less only at 3rd postoperative day of the follow up and we took KSS at 2, 6 and 12 weeks but not at 3rd postoperative day. Subvastus group had less pain at 3rd postoperative day which was significant statistically. No statistically significant differences found between two groups at 2-, 6- and 12-weeks follow-up periods. Similar results founded in other studies^{17, 24}. Similarly, Yuan et al²⁵ in a meta-analysis found SV approach to have less pain at 1st postoperative day with no significant differences after that (3rd day, 4 and 8 weeks). Our result may be due to the fact that less cut of extensor mechanism in SV approach may lead to less pain early postoperatively. Thereafter, no differences in pain can be found when soft tissue has healed.

In contrast, no differences in pain were found between two groups according to some other studies^{20, 22- 23}. Their results could be related to increased intake of analgesia. In term of preoperative variables, groups already differ in many parameters and therefore postoperative results may be affected. Finally short follow up time may affect our result and longer follow up time may be required to give more information about outcome of the 2 surgical approaches.

CONCLUSIONS

Subvastus group had earlier return of quadriceps function with less post operative pain but it was not affecting functional outcome. In our study, we found no evidence to support using one surgical approach over the other in view of long-

term clinical outcome. Both surgical approaches yield good clinical results with proper surgical techniques. With respect to our result, we think that, Overall function of the knee is determined by well balanced, properly aligned and stable implants rather than type of surgical approaches.

Declaration by Authors

Ethical Approval: Approved

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interests reported by any of author.

REFERENCES

1. Young B, Yong S, Eun Y. Comparison of the modified subvastus and medial parapatellar approaches in total knee arthroplasty. *International Orthopaedics (SICOT)* 2009; 33:419–23.
2. Vaishya R, Vijay V, Demesugh D.M. Surgical approaches for total knee arthroplasty. *J Clin Orthop Trauma*. 2016; 7(2):71–9.
3. Keshmiri A, Dotzauer F, Baier C. Stability of capsule closure and postoperative anterior knee pain after medial parapatellar approach in TKA. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*. 2017; 137:1019–24.
4. James R. B, James R. M, Michael R. W. Medial subvastus *versus* the medial parapatellar approach for total knee replacement. A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *EFORT Open Rev*. 2018; 3(3): 78–84.
5. Shah NA, Patil HG, Vaishnav VO, Savale A. Total knee arthroplasty using subvastus approach in stiff knee: A retrospective analysis of 110 cases. *Indian J Orthop*. 2016 Mar-Apr;50(2):166-71. doi: 10.4103/0019-5413.177582.
6. Peng X, Zhang X, Cheng T. Comparison of the quadriceps-sparing and subvastus approaches versus the standard parapatellar approach in total knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2015; 16:327-36
7. Sastre S, Sanchez MD, Lozano L. Total knee arthroplasty: better short-term results after subvastus approach: a randomized, controlled study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2009; 17(10):1184-8.
8. Wu Y, Zeng Y, Bao X. Comparison of mini-subvastus approach versus medial parapatellar approach in primary total knee arthroplasty. *Int J Surg*. 2018; 57:15-21.
9. Curtin B, Yakkanti M, Malkani A. Postoperative pain and contracture following total knee arthroplasty comparing parapatellar and subvastus approaches. *J Arthroplasty*. 2014; 29:33-6.
10. Bourke MG, Sclavos EK, Jull GA. A comparison of patellar vascularity between the medial parapatellar and subvastus approaches in total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2012; 27(6):1123-7.
11. Sabatini L, Nicolaci G, Atzori F. Biochemical stress evaluation after medial parapatellar and subvastus approach in total knee replacement. *Musculoskelet Surg*. 2018;102(2):185-90.
12. Insall JN, Dorr LD, Scott RD. Rationale of the knee society clinical rating system. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1989; 248:13–4
13. Haefeli M, Elfering M. Pain assessment. *Eur Spine J*. 2006; 15: S17–S24.
14. .Campbell's operative orthopaedics, 12th edn. Elsevier, Amsterdam.2013; pp 376–412
15. Hofmann AA, Plaster RL, Murdock LE. Subvastus (Southern) approach for primary knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 1991; 269:70–7
16. Wergzyn J, Parratte S, Coleman-Wood K et al. The John Insall award: No benefit of minimally invasive TKA on gait and strength outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2013; 471(1):46-55
17. Berstock J, Murray J, Whitehouse M, et al. Medial subvastus versus the medial parapatellar approach for total knee replacement. *EFORT Open Rev*. 2018; 3(3):78–84.
18. Sharma R, Meena R, Parmar R. Comparative Study of Minimal Invasive Subvastus Approach Versus Standard Medial Parapatellar Approach in Total Knee Arthroplasty. *Int J Innov Sci Res Technol*. 2019; 4:(7) 14-21
19. Chiang H, Lee C.C, Lin W.P, et al. Comparison of quadriceps-sparing minimally invasive and medial parapatellar total knee arthroplasty: a 2-year follow-up

- study. J Formosan Med Assoc. 2012;111(12):698–704
20. Van Hemert W, Senden R, Grimm B, et al. Early functional outcome after subvastus or parapatellar approach in knee arthroplasty is comparable. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2011; 19:943-51.
 21. Kholeif A, Radwan Y, Mansour A. Subvastus Approach is a Good Alternative for Primary TKA without Increase in Complication Rate. *Med. J. Cairo Univ.* 2017; 85 (2):575-82.
 22. Teng Y, Du W, Jiang J. Subvastus versus medial parapatellar approach in total knee arthroplasty: meta-analysis. *Orthopedics.* 2012; 35(12):722-31.
 23. Weinhardt C, Barisic M, Bergmann EG, et al. Early results of subvastus versus medial parapatellar approach in primary total knee arthroplasty. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2004; 124:401–3
 24. Kattimani R, Sadanandappa S, Dojode M. Ch. Medial parapatellar versus subvastus approach in total knee arthroplasty. *Int. J. Orthop. Sci.* 2018; 4(4):40-5.
 25. Yuan F, Zhang J, Jiang D. et al. Quadriceps-sparing versus traditional medial parapatellar approaches for total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2019;
- How to cite this article: Naveen Rathor, Suresh Kumar Bhatnagar, Saurabh Agrawal. Functional outcome of total knee replacement with medial parapatellar and subvastus approach: a comparative study. *Int. J. Sci. Healthc. Res.* 2025; 10(4): 42-47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijshr.20250407>
