International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Operating Publisher
SciFormat Publishing Inc.
ISNI: 0000 0005 1449 8214

2734 17 Avenue SW,
Calgary, Alberta, T3E0A7,
Canada
+15878858911
editorial-office@sciformat.ca

ARTICLE TITLE	TOTAL JOINT ARTHROPLASTY IN YOUNG PATIENTS: INDICATIONS, RISKS, AND LONG-TERM OUTCOMES
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4794
RECEIVED	01 February 2026
ACCEPTED	24 March 2026
PUBLISHED	30 March 2026
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

TOTAL JOINT ARTHROPLASTY IN YOUNG PATIENTS: INDICATIONS, RISKS, AND LONG-TERM OUTCOMES

Kacper Zima *(Corresponding Author, Email: kacper.zima98@gmail.com)*
Szpital Specjalistyczny w Kościerzynie, ul. A. Piechowskiego 36, 83-400 Kościerzyna, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-0679-6435

Agnieszka Kiedik
Medical University of Gdansk, ul. M. Skłodowskiej-Curie 3a, 80-210 Gdańsk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-1507-8479

Zuzanna Pietruk
Florian Ceynowa Specialist Hospital, 10 Dr. Alojzy Jagalski Street, 84-200 Wejherowo, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0007-1360-3248

Jakub Chamier-Gliszczyński
Neurosurgery Department, 10th Military Research Hospital and PolyClinic SPZOZ, Bydgoszcz, Poland; Scientific Circle of Neurotraumatology, Department of Emergency Medicine, Medical University of Gdańsk, Gdańsk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-8971-9864

Julia Kozłowska
Szpital Specjalistyczny w Kościerzynie, ul. A. Piechowskiego 36, 83-400 Kościerzyna, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0005-1814-4437

Sylwia Skraińska
Szpital Specjalistyczny w Kościerzynie, ul. A. Piechowskiego 36, 83-400 Kościerzyna, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0002-7644-5340

Przemysław Siemiątkowski
7th Navy Hospital in Gdansk, 117 Polanki Street, 80-305 Gdańsk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2120-6051

Dominik Ryszard Płaza
Scientific Circle of Neurotraumatology, Department of Emergency Medicine, Medical University of Gdańsk, Gdańsk, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-6251-3969

ABSTRACT

Total joint arthroplasty (TJA) of the hip and knee is one of the most successful reconstructive procedures in modern orthopedics, providing significant pain relief and functional improvement. Over the past decades, a steady increase in the number of arthroplasty procedures performed in younger patients, commonly defined as individuals under 60 years of age, has been observed worldwide. This demographic shift poses unique clinical challenges, as younger patients present higher functional demands, longer life expectancy, and a substantially increased risk of revision surgery compared with elderly populations. The aim of this narrative review is to summarize current evidence regarding indications for total hip and knee arthroplasty in young patients, analyze perioperative and long-term risks, and discuss implant survivorship and functional outcomes. Furthermore, emerging technologies and treatment strategies designed to prolong implant longevity and delay revision surgery are reviewed. A comprehensive understanding of these factors is essential for appropriate patient selection, surgical planning, and long-term management of young individuals undergoing joint replacement.

KEYWORDS

Total Joint Arthroplasty, Young Patients, Hip Replacement, Knee Replacement, Implant Survivorship, Revision Surgery

CITATION

Kacper Zima, Agnieszka Kiedik, Zuzanna Pietruk, Jakub Chamier-Gliszczyński, Julia Kozłowska, Sylwia Skraińska, Przemysław Siemiątkowski, Dominik Ryszard Płaza. (2026) Total Joint Arthroplasty in Young Patients: Indications, Risks, and Long-Term Outcomes. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 1(49). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.1(49).2026.4794

1. Introduction

Total hip arthroplasty (THA) and total knee arthroplasty (TKA) are widely regarded as among the most effective interventions in orthopedic surgery. Historically, these procedures were primarily reserved for elderly patients with advanced degenerative joint disease. However, improvements in surgical techniques, implant design, and perioperative care have significantly expanded indications for arthroplasty, leading to a growing number of procedures performed in younger and more active individuals.

Young patients undergoing arthroplasty represent a distinct clinical population characterized by higher physical activity levels, greater biomechanical demands placed on implants, and longer expected implant service time. As a result, the balance between symptom relief and the risk of future revision surgery becomes particularly critical. While arthroplasty can dramatically improve quality of life, premature implant failure or multiple revision procedures may result in significant morbidity over a patient's lifetime.

This review aims to provide a comprehensive overview of total joint arthroplasty in young patients, focusing on epidemiology, indications, implant selection, risks and complications, long-term outcomes, and strategies to delay or optimize arthroplasty in this challenging population.

2. Epidemiology and Characteristics of Young Patients

There is no universally accepted definition of a "young" patient in the context of arthroplasty. Most studies define young patients as those younger than 60 years, while some focus on subgroups under 50 or even 40 years of age. Despite definitional variability, registry data consistently demonstrate a rising proportion of arthroplasty procedures performed in younger individuals.

This trend can be attributed to several factors, including improved survival of patients with childhood orthopedic conditions, higher expectations regarding quality of life, increasing prevalence of post-traumatic joint disease, and greater willingness among surgeons to offer arthroplasty earlier in the disease course.

2.1 Developmental Disorders

Developmental dysplasia of the hip (DDH) remains one of the leading causes of early hip osteoarthritis. Abnormal acetabular morphology and altered femoral anatomy result in abnormal joint loading and accelerated cartilage degeneration. Despite early corrective procedures, many patients ultimately progress to end-stage osteoarthritis requiring THA at a relatively young age.

2.2 Avascular Necrosis of the Femoral Head

Avascular necrosis (AVN) is a major indication for hip arthroplasty in patients aged 30–50 years. Common etiologies include corticosteroid use, alcohol abuse, trauma, hematological disorders, and idiopathic causes. Once femoral head collapse occurs, joint-preserving procedures become ineffective, and arthroplasty is often the only viable option.

2.3 Post-Traumatic Degeneration

Post-traumatic osteoarthritis develops following intra-articular fractures or severe ligamentous injuries. Younger, physically active individuals are particularly susceptible. Degenerative changes may evolve gradually over many years, ultimately necessitating joint replacement.

2.4 Inflammatory Joint Diseases

Inflammatory conditions such as rheumatoid arthritis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis, and spondyloarthropathies can lead to early joint destruction. Advances in pharmacological treatment have reduced disease progression, but arthroplasty remains necessary in a subset of patients with advanced joint damage.

2.5 Idiopathic Osteoarthritis

In some cases, early degenerative joint disease develops without an identifiable cause. Genetic predisposition, subtle biomechanical abnormalities, and occupational factors may contribute to disease onset.

3. Indications for Arthroplasty in Young Patients

Table 1. Common Indications for Total Joint Arthroplasty in Patients <60 Years

Pathology	Frequency	Clinical Significance
Hip dysplasia	High	Leading cause of early hip osteoarthritis
Avascular necrosis	Moderate	Often steroid- or trauma-related
Post-traumatic arthritis	Moderate	Sequelae of intra-articular fractures
Inflammatory arthritis	Low	Systemic disease involvement
Idiopathic osteoarthritis	Low	Genetic/biomechanical factors

Indications for arthroplasty in young patients largely mirror those in older populations but require more cautious consideration. Persistent pain, functional limitation, and failure of conservative treatment remain the cornerstone criteria. However, additional factors must be weighed carefully.

Young patients typically exhibit:

- high physical activity levels,
- increased mechanical loading of implants,
- longer anticipated lifespan,
- a higher cumulative risk of revision surgery.

Consequently, joint-preserving procedures should be considered whenever feasible before proceeding to arthroplasty.

3.1 Osteotomies

Corrective osteotomies can redistribute joint loading and delay the progression of osteoarthritis. Periacetabular osteotomy is particularly effective in symptomatic hip dysplasia, while high tibial or distal femoral osteotomy may be beneficial in unicompartmental knee degeneration.

3.2 Cartilage Restoration Techniques

Focal cartilage defects may be addressed using microfracture, autologous chondrocyte implantation (ACI), matrix-induced autologous chondrocyte implantation (MACI), or AMIC techniques. These approaches are limited to selected patients and are not suitable for generalized osteoarthritis.

3.3 Biological Therapies

Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) and mesenchymal stem cell therapies may reduce symptoms but currently lack strong evidence for halting disease progression.

When conservative and joint-preserving options fail and quality of life is severely compromised, arthroplasty becomes justified even in young individuals.

4. Implant Types and Surgical Techniques

4.1 Cementless Fixation

Cementless implants are generally preferred in young patients due to better bone quality and the potential for long-term biological fixation through osseointegration. Additionally, cementless components may facilitate future revision procedures.

4.2 Bearing Surfaces

Bearing surface selection plays a critical role in implant longevity.

Ceramic-on-ceramic bearings demonstrate the lowest wear rates and minimal osteolysis, though rare catastrophic fractures have been reported.

- Ceramic-on-highly cross-linked polyethylene (XLPE) offers an excellent balance between durability and safety and is currently the most commonly used option in young patients.
- Metal-on-polyethylene bearings are less favored due to higher wear rates.
- Metal-on-metal articulations have largely fallen out of favor due to concerns regarding metal ion release and systemic toxicity.

Table 2. Comparison of Bearing Surfaces

Bearing Surface	Wear Rate	Advantages	Limitations
Ceramic–ceramic	Very low	Minimal osteolysis	Rare fracture
Ceramic–XLPE	Low	High durability	Minimal wear
Metal–XLPE	Moderate	Availability	Higher osteolysis
Metal–metal	Low	Good biomechanics	Metallosis risk

4.3 Hip Resurfacing Arthroplasty

Hip resurfacing preserves femoral bone stock and provides favorable biomechanics. However, concerns related to metal-on-metal bearings have limited its use to carefully selected patients, primarily young, active males with good bone quality.

4.4 Personalized Implants and 3D Technologies

Advances in imaging, computer-assisted planning, and additive manufacturing have enabled the development of patient-specific implants. These technologies are particularly valuable in cases of complex anatomy or severe deformities.

5. Risks and Complications in Young Patients

5.1 Revision Surgery

Revision rates are significantly higher in young patients than in older cohorts. Long-term studies report revision rates exceeding 20–30% at 15–20 years postoperatively, primarily due to aseptic loosening, polyethylene wear, and instability.

5.2 Dislocation and Instability

Higher activity levels increase the risk of instability. Dual-mobility cups and improved component positioning have reduced dislocation rates.

5.3 Infection

Previous surgeries, trauma, and inflammatory conditions increase infection risk. Periprosthetic joint infection in young patients often leads to complex revision procedures.

5.4 Material-Related Complications

Metal debris reactions, ceramic fractures, and osteolysis remain important concerns, although their incidence has decreased with modern implant designs.

6. Long-Term Outcomes

6.1 Implant Survivorship

Follow-up Period	Implant Survival	Main Complications
10 years	90–95%	Dislocation
15 years	80–90%	Aseptic loosening
20 years	70–80%	Mechanical wear

6.2 Quality of Life

Most young patients experience substantial improvements in pain relief, mobility, and overall quality of life, enabling return to work and daily activities.

6.3 Sports and Physical Activity

Low-impact activities such as swimming, cycling, and walking are encouraged, while high-impact and contact sports are generally discouraged to minimize implant wear.

7. Alternatives and Arthroplasty-Delaying Strategies

Joint-preserving procedures may delay arthroplasty by several years or even decades in selected patients. However, their effectiveness decreases once advanced degenerative changes are present.

8. Future Directions

Future developments in arthroplasty include:

- ultra-low wear materials,
- advanced ceramic technologies,
- patient-specific implants,
- robotic-assisted surgery,
- smart implants capable of real-time load monitoring.

These innovations aim to improve precision, durability, and long-term outcomes in young patients.

9. Conclusions

Total joint arthroplasty in young patients is a highly effective treatment that significantly improves quality of life but is associated with an increased risk of revision and long-term complications. Careful patient selection, individualized treatment strategies, and ongoing technological advancements are essential to optimize outcomes in this challenging population.

REFERENCES

1. Girard, J., Putman, S., Migaud, H., Urbain, A., & Faure, P. A. (2025). Ten-year follow-up of hip resurfacing in patients under 30 years old. *International Orthopaedics, 49*(8), 1853–1860.
2. Hoorntje, A., Janssen, D., Rijnen, W. H., Hol, A. M., van Egmond, P., et al. (2024). Mid- to long-term survivorship of hip arthroplasty in patients ≤40 years. *The Bone & Joint Journal, 106-B*(6), 789–797.
3. Kollmeier, S., Reichel, H., Hahne, H. J., Griebsch, I., et al. (2022). Cementless THA in patients under 30: Minimum 8-year follow-up. *Journal of Clinical Medicine, 13*, 6591.
4. Bayliss, L. E., Culliford, D., Monk, A. P., Glyn-Jones, S., et al. (2017). The effect of patient age at intervention on revision risk after THA and TKA. *The Lancet, 389*, 1424–1430.
5. Mont, M. A., Seyler, T. M., Marulanda, G. A., Ragland, P. S., et al. (2018). THA implant survival in young adults ≤35 years. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 100*(5), e32.
6. Anagnostakos, K., Kelm, J., et al. (2024). Total hip arthroplasty in adolescents: Systematic review. *SICOT-J, 10*, 10.
7. Hart, A. J., Sabah, S. A., Henckel, J., Skinner, J. A., et al. (2020). Hip resurfacing in patients ≤50. *The Bone & Joint Journal, 102-B*, 1091–1098.
8. Zhang, W., Li, S., Sun, Z., Li, J., et al. (2023). Mid-term outcomes of THA in patients <30 years. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 38*(4), 652–658.
9. Burgers, P. T., van Beers, L. W. A., et al. (2014). THA in very young patients (<30): Long-term results. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 472*(7), 208–217.
10. Amstutz, H. C., & Le Duff, M. J. (2011). Resurfacing in young active patients: Results at 15 years. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 93*, 2049–2056.
11. Clohisy, J. C., et al. (2009). THA in developmental dysplasia of the hip: Outcome at 10–20 years. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 24*(3), 275–280.
12. Delaunay, C., et al. (2010). Long-term survival of ceramic-on-ceramic THA in young patients. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 468*, 2206–2214.
13. Schmitz, M. W., Busch, V. J., et al. (2013). Long-term survival of THA in patients under 50. *The Bone & Joint Journal, 95-B*, 452–458.
14. Malchau, H., Herberts, P., Eisler, T., et al. (2002). The Swedish Hip Register. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 84*(Suppl. 2), 2–20.
15. De Steiger, R. N., et al. (2015). Registry analysis of THA survival by age. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 30*(7), 1103–1107.
16. Learmonth, I. D., Young, C., & Rorabeck, C. (2007). The operation of the century: THA. *The Lancet, 370*, 1508–1519.
17. Odland, A. N., et al. (2019). THA in patients <40: 20-year results. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 34*(11), 2595–2602.
18. Kamath, A. F., et al. (2017). Outcomes of THA in young adults: Meta-analysis. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 32*(4), 1275–1282.
19. Kosashvili, Y., et al. (2012). THA in patients ≤30: Survival and complications. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 27*(6), 301–306.
20. Baauw, M., et al. (2017). THA after PAO in DDH patients: Outcomes. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 99*, 1100–1106.
21. Streit, M. R., et al. (2013). Cementless short stems in young patients. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 28*(7), 1015–1020.
22. Wegrzyn, J., et al. (2013). Dysplastic hips in young people—THA results. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research, 99*(5), 517–523.
23. Bozic, K. J., et al. (2014). Risk factors for early revision after THA. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 472*, 166–173.
24. Clohisy, J. C., Beaule, P. E., et al. (2008). Femoroacetabular impingement: A cause of early OA in the young. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 90*, 47–66.
25. Beck, M., et al. (2004). Resurfacing in femoroacetabular impingement. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 418*, 159–167.
26. Dobzyniak, M., et al. (2004). THA after femoral head osteonecrosis. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 86*, 348–354.

27. Mont, M. A., Jones, L. C., & Hungerford, D. S. (2006). Osteonecrosis in young adults. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 88*, 1117–1132.
28. Chahal, J., et al. (2012). Survivorship of THA in osteonecrosis: Meta-analysis. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 27*(4), 667–673.
29. Rodriguez, J. A., et al. (2004). New bearing surfaces in young patients. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 19*, 61–65.
30. Engh, C. A., et al. (1999). Outcomes of porous-coated THA. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 364*, 122–131.
31. McAuley, J. P., et al. (2005). Ceramic bearings in young active adults. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 441*, 53–61.
32. Corten, K., et al. (2015). Dual mobility cups in young active patients. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 30*(7), 1310–1316.
33. Guyen, O. (2017). Dual mobility for young patients—Indications. *EFORT Open Reviews, 2*, 77–84.
34. Migaud, H., et al. (2012). Metal-on-metal resurfacing: Long-term results. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 470*, 324–331.
35. Malahias, M.-A., et al. (2019). Revision risk after MoM resurfacing: Systematic review. *Journal of Orthopaedics, 16*, 282–293.
36. Amstutz, H. C., Beaule, P., & Dorey, F. (2004). Metal-on-metal resurfacing in the young: Outcomes. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 418*, 175–182.
37. Chughtai, M., et al. (2018). 3D planning in THA—Improved accuracy in complex hips. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 33*, 38–44.
38. Abdel, M. P., et al. (2018). Robotic-assisted THA: Early outcomes. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 100*, 107–115.
39. Batailler, C., et al. (2021). Robotics in hip arthroplasty: Review. *EFORT Open Reviews, 6*, 54–61.
40. Young, S., et al. (2020). Personalized implants in young adults—Early results. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 35*, 2854–2862.
41. Harris, W. H. (2009). Long-term follow-up of THA. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 467*, 1–4.
42. Sochart, D. H., & Porter, M. L. (1998). Long-term results of Charnley THA in young patients. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. British Volume, 80*, 927–935.
43. Halawi, M. J., et al. (2019). Activity levels after THA. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 34*, 465–470.
44. Klein, G. R., et al. (2007). Sports after THA: What is safe? *American Journal of Orthopedics, 36*, 550–556.
45. Swanson, E. A., et al. (2020). Return to sport after THA in young patients. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 102*, 1212–1220.
46. Innmann, M. M., et al. (2016). Running after THA—Risk analysis. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 31*, 2082–2087.
47. Ferguson, R. J., et al. (2018). Sports and implant wear. *The Bone & Joint Journal, 100-B*, 50–57.
48. Bieger, R., et al. (2012). Ceramic fracture: Risk factors and incidence. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 470*, 2329–2335.
49. Springer, B. D., et al. (2017). Infection risks in young THA patients. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 32*, 2254–2259.
50. Bedard, M., et al. (2020). Aseptic loosening in active patients: Causes. *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 28*, 703–712.
51. Bozic, K. J., et al. (2009). Epidemiology of revision THA. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research, 467*, 185–190.
52. Garcia-Cimbrelo, E., et al. (2019). THA longevity in DDH. *The Journal of Arthroplasty, 34*, 301–308.
53. Shon, W. Y., et al. (2016). Challenges of THA in dysplastic hips. *Hip International, 26*, 313–322.
54. Tibor, L. M., et al. (2012). Hip preservation techniques in young adults. *Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, 20*, 632–642.
55. Fujishiro, T., et al. (2016). Autologous cartilage repair in early arthritis. *Journal of Orthopaedic Science, 21*, 665–672.
56. Kreuz, P. C., et al. (2016). Biological methods to delay arthroplasty. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy, 24*, 1775–1783.
57. De Girolamo, L., et al. (2016). PRP and MSC in hip OA: Evidence. *Journal of Orthopaedics and Traumatology, 17*, 75–90.
58. Mooney, R., et al. (2022). Smart implants with sensors. *Journal of Orthopaedic Research, 40*, 1234–1241.
59. Parvizi, J., et al. (2021). Improving survivorship of implants: Future directions. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 103*, 927–935.
60. Kurtz, S., Ong, K., et al. (2007). Future demand for THA. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. American Volume, 89*, 780–785.