



Integrating Patient-Specific Lifestyle Demands into Post-Arthroplasty Care: Hypothesis - Enhancement of HRQoL in Indian Patients

Peeyush Belsare¹,
Rajeev Joshi¹,
Sahil Sanghavi¹,
Mahavir Dugad¹,
Darshan Sonawane¹,
Ashok Shyam¹,
Parag Sancheti¹

¹Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of for Orthopedics and Rehabilitation PG College, Sivaji Nagar, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

Address of Correspondence

Dr. Peeyush Belsare,
Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of for Orthopedics and Rehabilitation PG College, Sivaji Nagar, Pune, Maharashtra, India.

E-mail: peeyushbelsare.03@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Arthritis of the hip and knee causes persistent pain, stiffness and loss of function that limit everyday activities and reduce quality of life. Total hip and knee replacement are effective treatments that relieve pain and restore mobility for most patients, but the size and timing of benefit vary with a patient's preoperative health, body weight, social support and access to rehabilitation. Studying how patient-reported outcomes change after surgery helps clinicians decide when to operate, how to prepare patients beforehand, and which supports speed recovery.

Hypothesis: We expected that most patients would experience large, clinically meaningful improvements in pain, joint-specific function and overall health-related quality of life within the first year after surgery, with the largest gains in the first three to six months. We also proposed that baseline function and modifiable factors — notably body mass index, comorbidities and psychosocial support — would influence both the amount of improvement and the final level of function at one year.

Clinical importance: Measuring outcomes from the patient's perspective highlights simple, practical ways to improve results: operate before severe functional decline when appropriate, optimize modifiable risks such as high body weight and uncontrolled medical conditions, screen for and address mental-health or expectation-related issues, and provide structured postoperative physiotherapy and education. These steps increase the chances that patients regain meaningful day-to-day abilities and are satisfied with their surgery, especially where rehabilitation resources are limited.

Future research: Longer follow-up will link early improvements to implant longevity and late complications. Trials of prehabilitation (weight loss, exercise, psychological support) would clarify whether improving modifiable risks before surgery leads to better long-term outcomes. Studies that adapt outcome measures and rehabilitation to cultural activities (for example squatting) will make recommendations more relevant to local patients.

Keywords: Total hip arthroplasty, Total knee arthroplasty, Quality of life, Patient-reported outcomes, Preoperative optimization, Rehabilitation.



Dr. Aparmeya Joshi



Dr. Rajeev Joshi
Hip & Knee Replacement
& Reconstruction



Dr. Sahil Sanghavi
Knee And Hip Surgeon



Dr. Mahavir Dugad
Hip Surgeon



Dr. Darshan Sonawane



Dr. Ashok Shyam



Dr. Parag Sancheti

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13107/jmt.2023.v09.i02.210>

© The Author(s). 2023 Open Access. This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and non-commercial reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

Background

Arthritis of the hip and knee is a common and often disabling problem. Pain, stiffness and reduced mobility make everyday tasks — walking, climbing stairs, sitting and squatting — difficult, and they take a real toll on quality of life. Over the years the goals of treatment have moved beyond simply keeping implants in place: we now measure success by how patients feel and function after surgery. Preoperative function strongly predicts what patients experience after joint replacement; those who are less disabled before surgery generally reach a higher final level of function, while those with worse baseline scores often show larger absolute improvements but may still lag behind in absolute terms [1]. Long-term follow-up studies show meaningful gains in patient-reported health for many years after arthroplasty, confirming durable benefit for appropriately selected patients [2].

Most published series find that the greatest relief from pain and the biggest functional gains happen early — within the first three to six months — with further smaller improvements or stabilization up to a year and beyond [3]. Age affects outcomes in complex ways: older patients may carry more comorbidity but can still enjoy large relative improvements, while younger patients often have different expectations tied to higher activity levels [4]. Appropriateness of surgery matters too; selecting patients who are likely to benefit improves both resource use and outcomes [5]. Alongside patient selection, implant survival and complication rates remain important, but these technical metrics alone do not capture how much better a patient's life has become after surgery [6].

Total knee and hip replacement have evolved over decades, and improvements in implant design, surgical technique and perioperative care have broadened the pool of patients who can safely undergo these operations [7]. Contemporary practice increasingly emphasizes a multidisciplinary approach — coordinated perioperative care, better pain control, early mobilization, physiotherapy and clear patient education — to speed recovery and improve longer-term outcomes [8]. Shared decision-making, where patients understand realistic goals and risks, is now central to planning arthroplasty and is linked to higher satisfaction after surgery [9].

Despite a strong international evidence base, differences in lifestyle, cultural expectations and activity demands mean that outcomes observed elsewhere may not map perfectly to every population. In countries where activities like squatting and sitting cross-legged remain important, the functional priorities after surgery differ from those emphasized in many western studies. This reality underscores the importance of studying health-related quality of life (HRQoL) in local patient groups, using validated patient-reported outcome measures that capture pain, stiffness, function and broader health domains. The thesis on which this synopsis is based addresses these questions by prospectively following patients undergoing primary total hip and knee arthroplasty and measuring changes

in PROMs over the first postoperative year. The aim is practical: to describe the magnitude and timing of improvement, and to identify the patient and treatment factors that most strongly influence recovery in our setting [1–9].

Hypothesis

This study grew out of three practical hypotheses that reflect what surgeons and patients commonly observe and what previous research suggests.

First, elective primary hip and knee arthroplasty produce large, clinically meaningful improvements in pain, joint-specific function and overall quality of life within a year after surgery, with most gains appearing early (by three to six months) and then stabilizing. This expectation is supported by multiple reports showing early, marked improvement in PROMs followed by sustained benefit at medium-term follow up [10–12]. Measuring patients at baseline and again at 3, 6 and 12 months allows us to capture both the speed and size of recovery and to confirm whether the same pattern holds in our patient population.

Second, preoperative clinical status influences both the amount of improvement and the final functional level. Patients who present with worse pain and poorer function often achieve large absolute improvements, but they may not reach the same final level as those who started with better function. This has implications for timing: operating earlier, before severe decline, may increase the chance that a patient returns to desired activities [13–16]. The study therefore examines how baseline WOMAC, SF-36 and joint-specific scores correlate with one-year outcomes, and whether practical thresholds exist that should inform when to recommend surgery.

Third, characteristics such as body mass index, presence of other medical problems, psychosocial status and expectations act as modifiers of outcome and are, in several cases, at least partly modifiable. Obesity is frequently associated with more complications and less favourable functional recovery after joint replacement, and psychological factors such as depression or unrealistic expectations can dampen perceived benefit even when objective measures improve [16–17]. Socioeconomic context and access to rehabilitation resources similarly shape recovery [14–17]. By testing the relationships between these variables and outcomes, the study aims to identify targets for preoperative optimization (for example weight management or treating depression) and perioperative interventions (structured rehabilitation, education) that can improve both objective recovery and patient satisfaction.

Taken together, these hypotheses address a straightforward clinical question: who benefits most from arthroplasty, when is the best time to operate to maximize improvement, and which modifiable factors should clinicians address before and after surgery to improve results? The thesis tests these ideas using standard statistical approaches — paired comparisons to evaluate within-subject change over time, regression analyses to

find independent predictors of outcomes, and subgroup comparisons between hip and knee patients — while using a mix of disease-specific and general health instruments to give a rounded, patient-centred view of recovery [10–17].

Discussion

The findings from this study fit comfortably with what many earlier, patient-focused reports have shown: people tend to feel markedly better after hip or knee replacement, especially in the early months after surgery. Pain relief and improvements in daily function are often the most noticeable changes patients describe, a pattern reported in large cohorts of arthroplasty patients [18, 19].

How patients start—how much pain and disability they have before surgery—still matters a great deal. Those who come to surgery with better function generally end up with higher function at follow-up, while those who are more disabled can show large absolute gains but may not reach the same final level. That pattern highlights a practical dilemma: waiting longer often means the chance to regain full function is smaller [20].

Social and practical supports clearly shape recovery. Patients with stronger social networks, stable finances and easy access to physiotherapy tend to recover more quickly and report higher satisfaction in the early months after surgery. Where rehabilitation is limited or follow-up is inconsistent, recovery can lag even when the operation itself is technically successful [21, 22].

Body weight emerged as an important, and at times modifiable, factor. Higher body mass index was associated with slower functional recovery and a higher risk of complications in this cohort. That finding supports programs that help patients reduce weight and optimize fitness before surgery, not as reasons to deny care but to improve the chance of a smoother recovery [23].

When we look specifically at hip replacement, many patients report durable improvements in quality of life across physical and social domains. These gains translate into better mobility and fewer restrictions in daily activities for a large proportion of patients. Still, there is variation between individuals—how much people return to specific cultural or lifestyle activities (for example deep squatting or sitting on the floor) can differ, and standard outcome tools may not capture those nuances completely [24].

Finally, prospective follow-up—measuring patient-reported outcomes at set intervals—proved invaluable. Tracking patients at baseline, three, six and twelve months gives a clear picture of the speed and scale of recovery, reveals who needs additional support, and helps clinicians and patients set realistic expectations. Short- and mid-term follow-up studies like this one are useful for guiding immediate care decisions and for designing targeted interventions to improve recovery [25].

There are limitations to keep in mind. This was a single-center, observational study with one-year follow-up: it tells us a lot

about early and intermediate recovery but not about long-term implant survival or very late complications. Cultural differences in daily activities mean some standard questionnaires may under- or over-estimate the functional limitations that matter most to patients here. Despite these limits, the results point toward clear, actionable steps clinicians can take to improve outcomes.

Clinical importance

Joint replacement for the hip or knee reliably eases pain and restores everyday function for most people — often within the first few months after surgery. Using patient-reported measures to assess pain and function before surgery helps decide the right timing: operating before a person's abilities fall too far often leads to a better final result. Simple, practical steps make a big difference: help patients optimize weight and control medical problems, screen and support mental health, give clear education about what to expect, and ensure access to basic physiotherapy and follow-up. In settings with limited resources, prioritizing patients who are likely to gain the most and making sure they receive focused rehab and support offers the best value for both patients and the health system.

Future directions

Future work should follow patients beyond one year to link early HRQoL improvements with implant longevity and late revisions. Randomized or controlled studies of prehabilitation, weight-reduction programs and focused psychosocial interventions would clarify whether improving modifiable risks before surgery translates into better long-term outcomes. Comparative studies of implant choices and fixation strategies that account for cultural activity demands (deep flexion, squatting) will help tailor surgery to local needs. Finally, qualitative research that explores patient expectations and day-to-day functional priorities can inform adaptation of PROMs and preoperative counseling so that measures and messages match what patients value most.

References

- Fortin PR, Clarke AE, Joseph L, Liang MH, Tanzer M, Ferland D, et al. Outcomes of total hip and knee replacement: preoperative functional status predicts outcomes at six months after surgery. *Arthritis Rheum.* 1999; 42(8):1722–8.
- Nilsdotter A-K, Isaksson F. Patient relevant outcome 7 years after total hip replacement for OA - a prospective study. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2010; 11:47.
- Neuprez A, Neuprez AH, Kaux J-F, Kurth W, Daniel C, Thirion T, et al. Early clinically relevant improvement in quality of life and clinical outcomes 1 year postsurgery in patients with knee and hip joint arthroplasties. *Cartilage.* 2018;9(2):127–39.
- Jones CA, Voaklander DC, Johnston DW, Suarez-Almazor ME. The effect of age on pain, function, and quality of life after total hip and knee arthroplasty. *Arch Intern Med.* 2001;

- 161(3):454–60.
5. Quintana JM, Escobar A, Arostegui I, Bilbao A, Azkarate J, Goenaga JI, Arenaza JC. Health-related quality of life and appropriateness of knee or hip joint replacement. *Arch Intern Med.* 2006; 166(2):220–6.
 6. Berry DJ, Scott Harmsen W, Cabanela ME, Morrey BF. Twenty-five-year survivorship of two thousand consecutive primary Charnley total hip replacements. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2002; 84:171–7.
 7. Patel NG, Waterson HB, Phillips JRA, Toms AD. 50 years of total knee arthroplasty. *Bone Jt* 2019; 8:3–7.
 8. Feng JE, Novikov D, Anoushiravani AA, Schwarzkopf R. Total knee arthroplasty: improving outcomes with a multidisciplinary approach. *J Multidiscip Healthc.* 2018; 11:63–73.
 9. Slover J, Alvarado C, Nelson C. Shared decision making in total joint replacement. *JBJS Rev.* 2014; 2(3).
 10. Barlow T, Griffin D, Barlow D, Realpe A. Patients' decision making in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review of qualitative research. *Bone Joint Res.* 2015; 4(10).
 11. Shan L, Shan B, Suzuki A, Nouh F, Saxena A. Intermediate and long-term quality of life after total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2015; 97:156–68.
 12. Bruyère O, Ethgen O, Neuprez A, Zégels B, Gillet P, Huskin JP, et al. Health-related quality of life after total knee or hip replacement for osteoarthritis: a 7-year prospective study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2012; 132(11):1583–7.
 13. Dowsey MM, Choong PF. The utility of outcome measures in total knee replacement surgery. *Int J Rheumatol.* 2013; 2013:353726.
 14. Xie F, Lo NN, Pullenayegum EM, Tarride JE, O'Reilly DJ, Goeree R, et al. Evaluation of health outcomes in osteoarthritis patients after total knee replacement: a two-year follow-up. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2010; 8:87.
 15. Fujita K, Makimoto K, Higo T, Shigematsu M, Hotokebuchi T. Changes in the WOMAC, EuroQol and Japanese lifestyle measurements among patients undergoing total hip arthroplasty. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2009; 17(7):848–55.
 16. Núñez M, Núñez E, Del Val JL, Ortega R, Segur JM, Hernández MV, et al. Health-related quality of life in patients with osteoarthritis after total knee replacement: factors influencing outcomes at 36 months of follow-up. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2007; 15(9):1001–7.
 17. Petrie K, Chamberlain K, Azariah R. The psychological impact of hip arthroplasty. *ANZ J Surg.* 1994; 64:115–7.
 18. Wiklund I, Romanus B. A comparison of quality of life before and after arthroplasty in patients who had arthrosis of the hip joint. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 1991; 73(5):765–9.
 19. O'Boyle CA, et al. Individual quality of life in patients undergoing hip replacement. *Lancet.* 1992; 339(8801):1088–91.
 20. Kauppila AM, Kyllönen E, Ohtonen P, Leppilahti J, Sintonen H, Arokoski JP. Outcomes of primary total knee arthroplasty: impact of patient-relevant factors on self-reported function and quality of life. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2011; 33(17-18):1659–67.
 21. Clement ND, Muzammil A, Macdonald D, Howie CR, Biant LC. Socioeconomic status affects the early outcome of total hip replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2011; 93(4):464–9.
 22. Rissanen P, Aro S, Sintonen H, Slätis P, Paavolainen P. Quality of life and functional ability in hip and knee replacements: a prospective study. *Qual Life Res.* 1996; 5(1):56–64.
 23. Järvenpää J, Kettunen J, Soininvaara T, Miettinen H, Kröger H. Obesity has a negative impact on clinical outcome after total knee arthroplasty. *Scand J Surg.* 2012; 101(3):198–203.
 24. Bagarić I, Šarac H, Borovac JA, Vlasković T, Bekavac J, Hebrang A. Primary total hip arthroplasty: health related quality of life outcomes. *Int Orthop.* 2014; 38(3):495–501.
 25. Martinez-Cano JP, Herrera-Escobar JP, Gutierrez ASA, Vergel AS, Martinez-Rondanelli A. Prospective quality of life assessment after hip and knee arthroplasty: short- and mid-term follow-up results. *Arthroplasty Today.* 2017; 3(6):125–30.

Conflict of Interest: Nil
Source of Support: None

Institute Where Research was Conducted: Department of Orthopaedics, Sancheti Institute of Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation, Shivajinagar, Pune, Maharashtra, India.
University Affiliation: MUHS, Nashik, Maharashtra, India.
Year of Acceptance of Thesis: 2021

How to Cite this Article: Belsare P, Joshi R, Sanghavi S, Dugad M, Sonawane D, Shyam A, Sancheti P. Integrating Patient-Specific Lifestyle Demands into Post-Arthroplasty Care: Hypothesis - Enhancement of HRQoL in Indian Patients. *Journal of Medical Thesis.* July-December 2023; 9(2):9-12.