# Characteristics of Subluxators Versus Dislocators in First-Time Anterior Shoulder Instability

Ehab M. Nazzal MD, Ian D. Engler MD, Zachary J. Herman MD, Janina Kaarre MD, Christopher M. Gibbs MD, Justin J. Greiner MD, Nicholas P. Drain MD, Ajinkya Rai BS, Noel Carlos BS, Lena Vodovtz BS, Confidence Njoku-Austin BS, Albert Lin MD

Pittsburgh Shoulder Institute, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Pittsburgh Medical Center







## Disclosures

Albert Lin, MD, FAAOS (Pittsburgh, PA)

AAOS: Board or committee member American Orthopaedic Association: Board or committee member American Orthopaedic Society for Sports Medicine: Board or committee member American Shoulder and Elbow Surgeons: Board or committee member Annals in Joint: Editorial or governing board Arthrex, Inc: Paid consultant Arthroscopy: Editorial or governing board International Society of Arthroscopy, Knee Surgery, and Orthopaedic Sports Medicine: Board or committee member Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy: Editorial or governing board Tornier: Paid consultant

No other authors have conflicts of interest to disclose







#### Introduction

 Little is known about the differences in clinical course between subluxators and dislocators presenting with first-time anterior shoulder instability (FTAI)

- Objective:
  - Compare epidemiology and outcomes between subluxators and dislocators after FTAI
- Hypothesis:
  - Subluxators will have a milder clinical presentation in comparison to dislocators







## Methods

- Surgically managed FTAI patients from a single institution between 2013-2020
- Defined subluxation and dislocation based on whether instability event required manual reduction
- Exclusion criteria: prior stabilization, multidirectional and recurrent instability.
- Labral tear location was determined using the clock method



Clock method for measuring labral tears. \* = coracoid process, denoting anterior shoulder







#### Results

Variable	Subluxator (n=137)	Dislocator (n=109)	P-value
Male, n (%)	97 (70.8)	79 (72.5)	0.9
BMI, median (SD)	25.9 <u>+</u> 6.5	26.5 <u>+</u> 6.5	0.4
Dominant Hand, n (%)	58 (54.2)	48 (51.6)	0.8
Bony Bankart, n (%)	12 (8.8)	16 (14.7)	0.06
Hill-Sachs, n (%)	72 (52.6)	96 (88.1)	<0.001
Rotator Cuff Tear, n (%)	9 (6.6)	12 (11.0)	0.3
SLAP Tear, n (%)	37 (27.0)	31 (28.4)	0.9
Labral Tear Size, median (SD)	3.4 <u>+</u> 2.1	3.4 <u>+</u> 1.9	1.0

Variable	Subluxator (n=137)	Dislocator (n=109)	P-value
Surgery, n (%)			0.3
Arthroscopic	118 (86)	87 (79.8)	
Open	15 (10.9)	19 (17.4)	
Latarjet	4 (2.9)	3 (2.8)	
Remplissag e	8 (6.0)	20 (18.9)	0.002
Anterior Labral Repair, n (%)	125 (91.2)	103 (29.9)	0.1
Anterior Anchors, median (SD)	3.2 <u>+</u> 1.3	3.5 <u>+</u> 1.0	0.1
Posterior Labral Repair, n (%)	43 (31.6)	32 (29.9)	0.8

- Revision rates: not significantly different between subluxators and dislocators (16.1% vs. 16.5%, p=1.0)
- No difference in the size or extent of the labral tears
- Hill-Sachs lesion more common in dislocators (88.1% vs 52.6%, p <0.001)







## Conclusion

- Subluxators and dislocators:
  - Similar clinical presentations
    - Exception: more Hill-Sachs lesions in dislocators
  - No difference in the extent of labral injury
  - No difference in surgical technique or revision rate
- Tendency to bias subluxation event as "less severe" should be reconsidered
- Future research on patient reported outcomes in both populations underway





