

· 临床研究 ·

# 不放置引流管对中重度膝骨关节炎 初次全膝关节置换术后快速康复的影响

杨建平, 吕正祥, 蒋涛, 谢国华

(常州市中医医院, 江苏 常州 213003)

**摘 要** **目的:**观察不放置引流管对中重度膝骨关节炎初次全膝关节置换术后快速康复的影响。**方法:**采用随机数字表将符合要求的 70 例中重度膝骨关节炎患者随机分为引流管组和非引流管组, 每组 35 例。2 组患者均行全膝关节置换术且在安装骨水泥假体时使用止血带, 引流管组在切口闭合前放置负压引流管并持续留置 48 h, 非引流管组正常闭合切口而不放置负压引流管。记录并比较 2 组患者的手术时间、住院时间、理论失血总量、输血情况、膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间、血红蛋白下降值、膝关节疼痛视觉模拟量表 (visual analogue scale, VAS) 评分、膝关节周径增加率、膝关节屈曲度、美国膝关节协会评分 (knee society score, KSS) 及并发症发生情况。**结果:**①一般指标。2 组患者手术时间、住院时间及理论失血总量比较, 组间差异均无统计学意义 [ $(87.11 \pm 7.16) \text{ min}$ ,  $(85.42 \pm 5.49) \text{ min}$ ,  $t = 1.105$ ,  $P = 0.273$ ;  $(7.74 \pm 2.20) \text{ d}$ ,  $(7.17 \pm 1.84) \text{ d}$ ,  $t = 1.179$ ,  $P = 0.243$ ;  $(1\ 268.00 \pm 299.86) \text{ mL}$ ,  $(1\ 170.00 \pm 182.62) \text{ mL}$ ,  $t = 1.639$ ,  $P = 0.106$ ]; 引流管组 11 例输血、非引流管组 8 例输血, 2 组患者输血率比较, 差异无统计学意义 ( $\chi^2 = 0.650$ ,  $P = 0.420$ ); 引流管组膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间长于非引流管组 [ $(5.63 \pm 1.06) \text{ d}$ ,  $(4.91 \pm 1.15) \text{ d}$ ,  $t = 2.206$ ,  $P = 0.009$ ]。②血红蛋白下降值。时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应 ( $F = 1.005$ ,  $P = 0.342$ ); 2 组患者血红蛋白下降值总体比较, 组间差异无统计学意义, 即不存在分组效应 ( $F = 1.598$ ,  $P = 0.211$ ); 手术前后不同时间点之间血红蛋白下降值的差异有统计学意义, 即存在时间效应 ( $F = 16\ 255.255$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 2 组患者血红蛋白下降值均呈先上升后平稳再下降趋势, 且 2 组的变化趋势完全一致 [ $(31.26 \pm 2.84) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(44.80 \pm 3.61) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(44.09 \pm 3.97) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(9.77 \pm 2.07) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $F = 10\ 065.255$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ;  $(30.00 \pm 3.09) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(43.86 \pm 3.93) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(43.14 \pm 3.85) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $(9.14 \pm 1.94) \text{ g} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $F = 6\ 776.683$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ]。③膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分。时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应 ( $F = 0.046$ ,  $P = 0.984$ ); 2 组患者膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分总体比较, 组间差异无统计学意义, 即不存在分组效应 ( $F = 0.596$ ,  $P = 0.443$ ); 手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分的差异有统计学意义, 即存在时间效应 ( $F = 97.350$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 2 组患者膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分均呈降低趋势, 且 2 组的降低趋势完全一致 [ $(3.71 \pm 0.80) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(3.44 \pm 0.87) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(2.53 \pm 0.85) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(1.74 \pm 0.76) \text{ 分}$ ,  $F = 65.184$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ;  $(3.58 \pm 0.74) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(3.29 \pm 0.99) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(2.45 \pm 1.10) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(1.67 \pm 0.79) \text{ 分}$ ,  $F = 38.258$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ]。④膝关节周径增加率。时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应 ( $F = 1.321$ ,  $P = 0.269$ ); 2 组患者膝关节周径增加率总体比较, 组间差异有统计学意义, 即存在分组效应 ( $F = 19.211$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节周径增加率的差异有统计学意义, 即存在时间效应 ( $F = 85.058$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 2 组患者膝关节周径增加率随时间均呈先上升后降低趋势, 但 2 组的变化趋势不完全一致 [ $(4.97 \pm 0.86) \%$ ,  $(5.84 \pm 0.83) \%$ ,  $(5.11 \pm 0.77) \%$ ,  $(3.96 \pm 0.77) \%$ ,  $F = 34.279$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ;  $(5.72 \pm 0.93) \%$ ,  $(6.51 \pm 0.98) \%$ ,  $(5.67 \pm 0.89) \%$ ,  $(4.22 \pm 0.84) \%$ ,  $F = 52.107$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ]; 术后 1 d、3 d 和 6 d, 引流管组膝关节周径增加率均小于非引流管组 ( $t = -3.522$ ,  $P = 0.001$ ;  $t = -3.053$ ,  $P = 0.003$ ;  $t = -2.808$ ,  $P = 0.007$ ); 术后 1 个月, 2 组患者膝关节周径增加率比较, 差异无统计学意义 ( $t = -1.370$ ,  $P = 0.175$ )。⑤膝关节屈曲度。时间因素与分组因素存在交互效应 ( $F = 3.402$ ,  $P = 0.011$ ); 2 组患者膝关节屈曲度总体比较, 组间差异有统计学意义, 即存在分组效应 ( $F = 6.676$ ,  $P = 0.012$ ); 手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节屈曲度的差异有统计学意义, 即存在时间效应 ( $F = 1\ 196.369$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 2 组患者膝关节屈曲度随时间均呈先下降后上升趋势, 且 2 组的变化趋势不完全一致 ( $87.80^\circ \pm 4.92^\circ$ ,  $44.09^\circ \pm 5.52^\circ$ ,  $67.09^\circ \pm 4.18^\circ$ ,  $81.51^\circ \pm 6.24^\circ$ ,  $103.34^\circ \pm 6.18^\circ$ ,  $F = 636.930$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ;  $86.34^\circ \pm 5.32^\circ$ ,  $49.02^\circ \pm 5.56^\circ$ ,  $69.29^\circ \pm 5.07^\circ$ ,  $83.03^\circ \pm 5.37^\circ$ ,  $104.46^\circ \pm 5.17^\circ$ ,  $F = 561.441$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ); 术后 1 d、6 d、1 个月和 1 年, 2 组患者膝关节屈曲度比较, 差异均无统计学意义 ( $t = 1.190$ ,  $P = 0.238$ ;  $t = -1.981$ ,  $P = 0.052$ ;  $t = -1.089$ ,  $P = 0.280$ ;  $t = -0.818$ ,  $P = 0.416$ ); 术后 3 d, 引流管组膝关节屈曲度小于非引流管组 ( $t = -3.734$ ,  $P = 0.000$ )。⑥KSS 评分。术前和术后 1 年, 2 组患者 KSS 评分比较, 差异均无统计学意义 [ $(67.00 \pm 4.32) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(66.23 \pm 4.77) \text{ 分}$ ,  $t = 0.710$ ,  $P = 0.480$ ;  $(159.85 \pm 5.93) \text{ 分}$ ,  $(160.57 \pm 6.81) \text{ 分}$ ,  $t = -0.468$ ,  $P = 0.641$ ]; 术后 1 年, 2 组患者 KSS 评分均较术前增加 ( $t = -85.886$ ,  $P = 0.000$ ;  $t = -81.456$ ,  $P = 0.000$ )。⑦安全性。引流管组 2 例发生无症状性肌间静脉血栓, 1 例发生切口相关并发症; 非引流管组 3 例发生无症状性肌间静脉血栓, 3 例发

生切口相关并发症。切口相关并发症经对症处理后,切口均完全愈合;无症状性肌间静脉血栓给予常规抗凝处理后,血栓消失。2 组患者均无手术相关感染、肺栓塞等并发症发生。2 组患者并发症发生率比较,差异无统计学意义( $\chi^2 = 0.510, P = 0.475$ )。结论:在中重度膝骨关节炎初次全膝关节置换术后不放置引流管,能早期改善膝关节活动度,并发症少,虽然对早期预防血肿形成不利,但对膝关节疼痛缓解和膝关节功能恢复无明显影响,有利于术后快速康复的实施。

**关键词** 骨关节炎;膝;关节成形术;置换;引流管;康复

## Effects of drainage tube on rapid rehabilitation after primary total knee arthroplasty in patients with moderate-to-severe knee osteoarthritis

YANG Jianping, LYU Zhengxiang, JIANG Tao, XIE Guohua

Changzhou Hospital of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Changzhou 213003, Jiangsu, China

**ABSTRACT** **Objective:** To observe the effects of drainage tube on rapid rehabilitation after primary total knee arthroplasty (TKA) in patients with moderate-to-severe knee osteoarthritis (KOA). **Methods:** Seventy patients with moderate-to-severe KOA were enrolled in the study and were randomly divided into drainage tube group and non-drainage tube group by using random digits table, 35 cases in each group. The TKA were performed on all patients in the 2 groups, and a tourniquet was used when the bone cement prosthesis was installed. The negative - pressure drainage tube was placed before the incision was closed and was retained for 48 hours in patients of drainage tube group, while the incision was normally closed and no negative - pressure drainage tube was placed in patients of non-drainage tube group. The operative time, hospital stay, theoretical total blood loss, blood transfusion, the time spent in bending knee initiatively to a angle of 90 degrees, decreased values of hemoglobin (Hb) content, knee pain visual analogue scale (VAS) score, knee circumference increasing rate, knee flexion - extension range, American knee society score (KSS) and postoperative complications were recorded and compared between the 2 groups. **Results:** There was no statistical difference in operative time, hospital stay and theoretical total blood loss between the 2 groups ( $87.11 \pm 7.16$  vs  $85.42 \pm 5.49$  min,  $t = 1.105, P = 0.273$ ;  $7.74 \pm 2.20$  vs  $7.17 \pm 1.84$  days,  $t = 1.179, P = 0.243$ ;  $1268.00 \pm 299.86$  vs  $1170.00 \pm 182.62$  mL,  $t = 1.639, P = 0.106$ ). Blood transfusions were performed on 11 patients in drainage tube group and 8 patients in non-drainage tube group. There was no statistical difference in the blood transfusion rate between the 2 groups ( $\chi^2 = 0.650, P = 0.420$ ). The time spent in bending knee initiatively to a angle of 90 degrees was longer in drainage tube group compared to non-drainage tube group ( $5.63 \pm 1.06$  vs  $4.91 \pm 1.15$  days,  $t = 2.206, P = 0.009$ ). There was no interaction between time factor and group factor in decreased values of Hb content ( $F = 1.005, P = 0.342$ ). There was no statistical difference in decreased values of Hb content between the 2 groups in general, in other words, there was no group effect ( $F = 1.598, P = 0.211$ ). There was statistical difference in decreased values of Hb content between different timepoints before and after the surgery, in other words, there was time effect ( $F = 16255.255, P = 0.000$ ). The decreased values of Hb content presented a time - dependent trend of increasing firstly and keeping subsequently and decreasing finally in both of the 2 groups, and the 2 groups were consistent with each other in the variation tendency of decreased values of Hb content ( $31.26 \pm 2.84, 44.80 \pm 3.61, 44.09 \pm 3.97, 9.77 \pm 2.07$  g/L,  $F = 10065.255, P = 0.000$ ;  $30.00 \pm 3.09, 43.86 \pm 3.93, 43.14 \pm 3.85, 9.14 \pm 1.94$  g/L,  $F = 6776.683, P = 0.000$ ). There was no interaction between time factor and group factor in knee pain VAS scores ( $F = 0.046, P = 0.984$ ). There was no statistical difference in knee pain VAS scores between the 2 groups in general, in other words, there was no group effect ( $F = 0.596, P = 0.443$ ). There was statistical difference in knee pain VAS scores between different timepoints before and after the surgery, in other words, there was time effect ( $F = 97.350, P = 0.000$ ). The knee pain VAS scores presented a time - dependent decreasing trend in both of the 2 groups, and the 2 groups were consistent with each other in the decreasing trend of knee pain VAS scores ( $3.71 \pm 0.80, 3.44 \pm 0.87, 2.53 \pm 0.85, 1.74 \pm 0.76$  points,  $F = 65.184, P = 0.000$ ;  $3.58 \pm 0.74, 3.29 \pm 0.99, 2.45 \pm 1.10, 1.67 \pm 0.79$  points,  $F = 38.258, P = 0.000$ ). There was no interaction between time factor and group factor in knee circumference increasing rate ( $F = 1.321, P = 0.269$ ). There was statistical difference in knee circumference increasing rate between the 2 groups in general, in other words, there was group effect ( $F = 19.211, P = 0.000$ ). There was statistical difference in knee circumference increasing rate between different timepoints before and after the surgery, in other words, there was time effect ( $F = 85.058, P = 0.000$ ). The knee circumference increasing rate presented a time - dependent trend of increasing firstly and decreasing subsequently in both of the 2 groups, and the 2 groups were inconsistent with each other in the knee circumference increasing rate ( $4.97 \pm 0.86, 5.84 \pm 0.83, 5.11 \pm 0.77, 3.96 \pm 0.77\%$ ,  $F = 34.279, P = 0.000$ ;  $5.72 \pm 0.93, 6.51 \pm 0.98, 5.67 \pm 0.89, 4.22 \pm 0.84\%$ ,  $F = 52.107$ ,

$P=0.000$ ). The knee circumference increasing rate was smaller in drainage tube group compared to non-drainage tube group at postoperative day 1, 3 and 6 ( $t = -3.522, P=0.001; t = -3.053, P=0.003; t = -2.808, P=0.007$ ). There was no statistical difference in knee circumference increasing rate between the 2 groups at 1 month after the surgery ( $t = -1.370, P=0.175$ ). There was interaction between time factor and group factor in knee flexion-extension range ( $F=3.402, P=0.011$ ). There was statistical difference in knee flexion-extension range between the 2 groups in general, in other words, there was group effect ( $F=6.676, P=0.012$ ). There was statistical difference in knee flexion-extension range between different timepoints before and after the surgery, in other words, there was time effect ( $F=1196.369, P=0.000$ ). The knee flexion-extension range presented a time-dependent trend of decreasing firstly and increasing subsequently in both of the 2 groups, and the 2 groups were inconsistent with each other in the knee flexion-extension range ( $87.80 \pm 4.92, 44.09 \pm 5.52, 67.09 \pm 4.18, 81.51 \pm 6.24, 103.34 \pm 6.18$  degrees,  $F=636.930, P=0.000; 86.34 \pm 5.32, 49.02 \pm 5.56, 69.29 \pm 5.07, 83.03 \pm 5.37, 104.46 \pm 5.17$  degrees,  $F=561.441, P=0.000$ ). There was no statistical difference in knee flexion-extension range between the 2 groups at 1 day, 6 days, 1 month and 1 year after the surgery ( $t = 1.190, P=0.238; t = -1.981, P=0.052; t = -1.089, P=0.280; t = -0.818, P=0.416$ ). The knee flexion-extension range was smaller in drainage tube group compared to non-drainage tube group at postoperative day 3 ( $t = -3.734, P=0.000$ ). There was no statistical difference in KSS scores between the 2 groups before the surgery and at 1 year after the surgery ( $67.00 \pm 4.32$  vs  $66.23 \pm 4.77$  points,  $t = 0.710, P=0.480; 159.85 \pm 5.93$  vs  $160.57 \pm 6.81$  points,  $t = -0.468, P=0.641$ ). The KSS scores increased in both of the 2 groups at 1 year after the surgery compared to pre-surgery ( $t = -85.886, P=0.000; t = -81.456, P=0.000$ ). The asymptomatic intermuscular venous thrombosis were found in 2 patients of drainage tube group and 3 patients of non-drainage tube group, and incision-related complications were found in 1 patient of drainage tube group and 3 patients of non-drainage tube group. The incision healed completely after the incision-related complications were treated with symptomatic supportive treatment, and the asymptomatic intermuscular venous thrombosis disappeared after conventional anticoagulation. No complications such as surgery-related infection and pulmonary embolism were found in the 2 groups. There was no statistical difference in complication incidences between the 2 groups ( $\chi^2 = 0.510, P=0.475$ ). **Conclusion:** Non-drainage can improve the range of motion of knee in the early period after primary TKA in patients with moderate-to-severe KOA, and it has less complications. Although it is detrimental to the early prevention of hematoma formation, it has no obvious effect on knee pain relief and knee function recovery, and it is conducive to the implementation of postoperative rapid rehabilitation.

**Keywords** osteoarthritis, knee; arthroplasty, replacement, knee; drainage tube; rehabilitation

人工全膝关节置换术 (total knee arthroplasty, TKA) 是重建膝关节功能、缓解疼痛、纠正畸形的有效治疗方法,但术后存在康复时间长、患者满意度差、并发症多等问题。快速康复外科于 2001 年由丹麦外科医生 Kehle<sup>[1]</sup> 提出,该理念是指通过一系列有循证医学证据的围手术期优化处理方案,减轻手术创伤应激反应、减少器官功能障碍和并发症的发生、缩短住院时间,以达到患者快速康复的目的<sup>[2]</sup>。近年来我们已将快速康复理念应用于 TKA,且在临床取得了良好的效果。术中使用止血带及术后放置引流管是大部分关节外科医生实施 TKA 的常规操作。近年来有许多 meta 分析提示,TKA 术中使用止血带的时间越短,在患者早期康复阶段会更有利于改善关节疼痛和活动度,恢复关节功能<sup>[3-5]</sup>。从理论上讲,TKA 术后放置引流管能有效预防血肿的形成、减少切口相关并发症的发生和减轻局部组织的张力和疼痛,从而有利于术后快速康复的实施;但放置引流管同样也带来一些问

题,如缺乏填塞效应而增加失血量,通过引流管引入细菌而致深部感染,同时还需额外的护理和成本支出,而且引流管的存在会导致患者心存顾虑,不能配合早期功能锻炼,不利于术后快速康复。TKA 术后是否放置引流管目前尚存争议。为了进一步探讨 TKA 术后不放置引流管对术后快速康复的影响,我们对 70 例中重度膝骨关节炎患者行 TKA 治疗时,在切口闭合前分别使用负压引流管和不使用负压引流管,并对其疗效和安全性进行了比较,现报告如下。

## 1 临床资料

**1.1 一般资料** 纳入研究的患者共 70 例,男 31 例、女 39 例。年龄 52~78 岁,中位数 68 岁。均为 2015 年 6 月至 2017 年 6 月在常州市中医医院住院治疗的中重度骨关节炎患者。均为初次接受单侧 TKA 术患者。体质量指数  $18 \sim 36 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ ,中位数  $26 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ 。试验方案经医院医学伦理委员会审查通过。

**1.2 诊断标准** 采用《骨关节炎诊治指南(2007 年

版)》中的膝骨关节炎诊断标准<sup>[6]</sup>:①近 1 个月内反复膝关节疼痛;②X 线片(站立或负重位)示关节间隙变窄、软骨下骨硬化和(或)囊性变、关节缘骨赘形成;③关节液(至少 2 次)清亮、黏稠,白细胞 $<2000$  个 $\cdot$  mL<sup>-1</sup>;④年龄 $\geq 40$  岁;⑤晨僵 $\leq 30$  min;⑥活动时骨摩擦音(感)。符合①②条或①③⑤⑥条或①④⑤⑥条即可诊断为膝骨关节炎。

**1.3 纳入标准** ①符合上述诊断标准;②单纯中重度膝骨关节炎经积极非手术治疗后无效;③首次行 TKA;④自愿参与本研究,并签署知情同意书。

**1.4 排除标准** ①合并局部或全身活动性感染者;②合并出血性疾病者;③术前血红蛋白(hemoglobin, Hb)偏低者(男性 Hb $<130$  g $\cdot$  L<sup>-1</sup>, 女性 Hb $<120$  g $\cdot$  L<sup>-1</sup>);④最近服用抗凝药物和抗血小板药物者。

## 2 方法

**2.1 分组方法** 采用随机数字表将符合要求的 70 例患者随机分为引流管组和非引流管组。

**2.2 治疗方法** 2 组患者手术方法一样,均选用 Gemini 型后又保留型活动平台骨水泥关节假体(德国 LINK 公司)。采用腰硬联合阻滞麻醉,患者仰卧位,取膝前正中髌旁内侧入路。2 组患者在完成胫骨及股骨截骨后均上止血带,在所有假体组件安装好后松止血带;均不进行髌骨置换,去除骨赘后行周围去神经化。引流管组在切口闭合前放置负压引流管并持续留置 48 h,非引流管组正常闭合切口而不放置负压引流管。整个手术过程进行仔细充分的止血,髓腔开口处取自体骨条填塞。2 组患者在围手术期均按文献<sup>[7]</sup>的方法进行快速康复模式管理。

**2.3 疗效及安全性对比方法** 记录并比较 2 组患者的手术时间、住院时间、理论失血总量、输血情况、膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间、Hb 下降值、膝关节疼痛视觉模拟量表(visual analogue scale, VAS)评分<sup>[8]</sup>、膝关节周径增加率、膝关节屈曲度、美国膝关节协会评分(knee society score, KSS)<sup>[9]</sup>及并发症发生情况。Hb 下

降值=术前 Hb 值-术后 Hb 值。应用 Nadler 方程<sup>[10]</sup>计算血容量:血容量=k<sub>1</sub>×身高(m)<sup>3</sup>+k<sub>2</sub>×体重(kg)+k<sub>3</sub>(男性 k<sub>1</sub>=0.367、k<sub>2</sub>=0.032、k<sub>3</sub>=0.604;女性 k<sub>1</sub>=0.356、k<sub>2</sub>=0.033、k<sub>3</sub>=0.183)。应用 Gross 线性方程<sup>[11]</sup>计算手术理论失血总量:理论失血总量=术前血容量×(术前红细胞压积-术后红细胞压积)/术前红细胞压积(按术后第 3 天红细胞压积计算)。当 Hb $<70$  g $\cdot$  L<sup>-1</sup>或有心肌梗塞、动脉硬化性血管疾病等危险因素的患者 Hb 为 80~100 g $\cdot$  L<sup>-1</sup>时进行输血并记录输血量。膝关节周径增加率(%)=(术后膝关节周径-术前膝关节周径)/术前膝关节周径×100%。

**2.4 数据统计方法** 采用 SPSS20.0 统计软件对所得数据进行统计学分析,2 组患者性别、输血率的组间比较采用 $\chi^2$  检验,年龄、体质量指数、术前 Hb、手术时间、住院时间、理论失血总量、膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间的组间比较及 KSS 评分的组间、组内比较均采用 t 检验,Hb 下降值、膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分、膝关节周径增加率、膝关节屈曲度的比较均采用重复测量资料的方差分析,并发症发生率的比较采用四格表校正 $\chi^2$  检验,检验水准 $\alpha=0.05$ 。

## 3 结果

**3.1 分组结果** 引流管组和非引流管组各 35 例。2 组患者基线资料比较,差异无统计学意义,有可比性(表 1)。

**3.2 一般指标** 2 组患者手术时间、住院时间、理论失血总量及输血率比较,组间差异均无统计学意义;引流管组膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间长于非引流管组(表 2)。

**3.3 Hb 下降值** 时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应;2 组患者 Hb 下降值总体比较,组间差异无统计学意义,即不存在分组效应;手术前后不同时间点之间 Hb 下降值的差异有统计学意义,即存在时间效应;2 组患者 Hb 下降值均呈先上升后平稳再下降趋势,且 2 组的变化趋势完全一致(表 3)。

表 1 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的基线资料

组别	样本量 (例)	性别(例)		年龄 ( $\bar{x}\pm s$ , 岁)	体质量指数 ( $\bar{x}\pm s$ , kg $\cdot$ m <sup>-2</sup> )	术前血红蛋白 ( $\bar{x}\pm s$ , g $\cdot$ L <sup>-1</sup> )
		男	女			
引流管组	35	15	20	68.91 $\pm$ 5.09	26.89 $\pm$ 3.47	135.00 $\pm$ 5.83
非引流管组	35	16	19	68.14 $\pm$ 4.85	26.06 $\pm$ 3.21	129.00 $\pm$ 5.66
检验统计量		$\chi^2=0.058$		$t=0.649$	$t=1.037$	$t=0.790$
P 值		0.810		0.581	0.303	0.432

**3.4 膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分** 时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应;2 组患者膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分总体比较,组间差异无统计学意义,即不存在分组效应;手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分的差异有统计学意义,即存在时间效应;2 组患者膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分均呈降低趋势,且 2 组的降低趋势完全一致(表 4)。

**3.5 膝关节周径增加率** 时间因素与分组因素不存在交互效应;2 组患者膝关节周径增加率总体比较,组间差异有统计学意义,即存在分组效应;手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节周径增加率的差异有统计学意义,即存在时间效应;2 组患者膝关节周径增加率随时

一致;术后 1 d、术后 3 d、术后 6 d,引流管组膝关节周径增加率均小于非引流管组;术后 1 个月 2 组患者膝关节周径增加率比较,差异无统计学意义(表 5)。

**3.6 膝关节屈曲度** 时间因素与分组因素存在交互效应;2 组患者膝关节屈曲度总体比较,组间差异有统计学意义,即存在分组效应;手术前后不同时间点之间膝关节屈曲度的差异有统计学意义,即存在时间效应;2 组患者膝关节屈曲度随时间均呈先下降后上升趋势,且 2 组的变化趋势不完全一致;术后 1 d、术后 6 d、术后 1 个月,2 组患者膝关节屈曲度比较,差异均无统计学意义;术后 3 d 引流管组膝关节屈曲度小于非引流管组(表 6)。

表 2 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的一般指标

组别	样本量 (例)	手术时间 ( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , min)	住院时间 ( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , d)	理论失血总量 ( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , mL)	膝关节主动屈曲 90° 所需时间( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , d)	输血情况(例)	
						输血	未输血
引流管组	35	87.11 ± 7.16	7.74 ± 2.20	1 268.00 ± 299.86	5.63 ± 1.06	11	24
非引流管组	35	85.42 ± 5.49	7.17 ± 1.84	1 170.00 ± 182.62	4.91 ± 1.15	8	27
<i>t</i> 值		1.105	1.179	1.639	2.206	0.650	
<i>P</i> 值		0.273	0.243	0.106	0.009	0.420	

表 3 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的血红蛋白下降值

组别	样本量 (例)	血红蛋白下降值( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , g · L <sup>-1</sup> )					<i>F</i> 值	<i>P</i> 值
		术后 1 d	术后 2 d	术后 3 d	术后 1 个月	合计		
引流管组	35	31.26 ± 2.84	44.80 ± 3.61	44.09 ± 3.97	9.77 ± 2.07	32.48 ± 14.57	10 065.255	0.000
非引流管组	35	30.00 ± 3.09	43.86 ± 3.93	43.14 ± 3.85	9.14 ± 1.94	31.54 ± 14.48	6 776.683	0.000
合计	70	30.63 ± 3.01	44.33 ± 3.78	43.61 ± 3.91	9.46 ± 2.02	32.01 ± 14.51	16 255.255 <sup>1)</sup>	0.000 <sup>1)</sup>
检验统计量		1.772	1.044	1.009	1.309	1.598 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>F</i> = 1.005 <sup>2)</sup> ,	
<i>P</i> 值		0.081	0.300	0.317	0.195	0.211 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>P</i> = 0.342 <sup>2)</sup>	

1) 主效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值;2) 交互效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值

表 4 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的膝关节疼痛视觉模拟量表评分

组别	样本量 (例)	膝关节疼痛视觉模拟量表评分( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , 分)					<i>F</i> 值	<i>P</i> 值
		术后 1 d	术后 3 d	术后 6 d	术后 1 个月	合计		
引流管组	35	3.71 ± 0.80	3.44 ± 0.87	2.53 ± 0.85	1.74 ± 0.76	2.85 ± 1.13	65.184	0.000
非引流管组	35	3.58 ± 0.74	3.29 ± 0.99	2.45 ± 1.10	1.67 ± 0.79	2.75 ± 1.18	38.258	0.000
合计	70	3.64 ± 0.77	3.37 ± 0.93	2.49 ± 0.98	1.71 ± 0.77	2.80 ± 1.15	97.350 <sup>1)</sup>	0.000 <sup>1)</sup>
检验统计量		0.698	0.678	0.328	0.400	0.596 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>F</i> = 0.046 <sup>2)</sup> ,	
<i>P</i> 值		0.488	0.500	0.744	0.690	0.443 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>P</i> = 0.984 <sup>2)</sup>	

1) 主效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值;2) 交互效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值

表 5 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的膝关节周径增加率

组别	样本量 (例)	膝关节周径增加率( $\bar{x} \pm s$ )					<i>F</i> 值	<i>P</i> 值
		术后 1 d	术后 3 d	术后 6 d	术后 1 个月	合计		
引流管组	35	(4.97 ± 0.86)%	(5.84 ± 0.83)%	(5.11 ± 0.77)%	(3.96 ± 0.77)%	(4.97 ± 1.05)%	34.279	0.000
非引流管组	35	(5.72 ± 0.93)%	(6.51 ± 0.98)%	(5.67 ± 0.89)%	(4.22 ± 0.84)%	(5.73 ± 0.93)%	52.107	0.000
合计	70	(5.35 ± 0.97)%	(6.18 ± 0.97)%	(5.39 ± 0.87)%	(4.09 ± 0.81)%	(5.25 ± 1.17)%	85.058 <sup>1)</sup>	0.000 <sup>1)</sup>
检验统计量		-3.522	-3.053	-2.808	-1.370	19.211 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>F</i> = 1.321 <sup>2)</sup> ,	
<i>P</i> 值		0.001	0.003	0.007	0.175	0.000 <sup>1)</sup>	<i>P</i> = 0.269 <sup>2)</sup>	

1) 主效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值;2) 交互效应的 *F* 值和 *P* 值

**3.7 KSS 评分** 术前和术后 1 年, 2 组患者 KSS 评分比较, 差异均无统计学意义; 术后 1 年, 2 组患者 KSS 评分均较术前增加(表 7)。

**3.8 安全性** 引流管组 2 例发生无症状性肌间静脉血栓, 1 例发生切口相关并发症; 非引流管组 3 例发生无症状性肌间静脉血栓, 3 例发生切口相关并发症。切口相关并发症经对症处理后, 切口均完全愈合; 无症状性肌间静脉血栓给予常规抗凝处理后, 血栓消失。2 组患者均无手术相关感染、肺栓塞等并发症发生。2 组患者并发症发生率比较, 差异无统计学意义( $\chi^2=0.510, P=0.475$ )。

## 4 讨论

目前 TKA 已被认为是治疗终末期膝骨关节炎的最佳方案<sup>[12-13]</sup>。但行 TKA 术后仍存在康复和住院时间过长以及部分患者功能恢复欠佳等问题<sup>[14]</sup>。国内外有学者报道<sup>[15-19]</sup>将快速康复模式应用于 TKA, 能促进膝关节功能改善, 缩短康复时间, 减少住院时间和并发症的发生等。我们前期研究<sup>[7]</sup>同样也发现将快速康复模式应用于 TKA, 能促进患肢功能早期恢复, 缩短住院和康复时间; 同时还发现止血带优化使用能明显减少患肢肌肉软组织损伤及术后应激反应, 更有利于快速康复模式的实施。在本研究中 2 组患者均采用止血带优化策略, 仅在安装骨水泥假体时使用止血带。

有研究认为<sup>[20-21]</sup>引流可以减少 TKA 术后切口内血肿形成, 降低切口张力, 减少切口疼痛, 降低切口感染和不愈合率, 促进关节功能早期康复, 理论上有利于配合 TKA 术后快速康复的实施。但 Parker

等<sup>[22-24]</sup>研究认为, 在感染发生率、术后肢体肿胀率、关节功能康复等方面, 引流管组和非引流管组比较, 差异无统计学意义。本研究结果显示, 非引流管组患者术后膝关节主动屈曲 90°所需时间小于引流管组, 且术后 3 d 膝关节主动屈曲角度大于引流管组。说明放置引流管不利于患者术后早期膝关节活动度的改善, 而不放置引流管则更有利于术后早期膝关节活动度的改善。这可能与引流管的存在导致患者心存顾虑, 难以配合早期功能锻炼有关, 从而不利于术后快速康复的进程。通过观察术后膝关节周径增加率的变化可以评估血肿形成情况。术后 1 d、3 d 和 6 d 引流管组膝关节周径增加率均小于非引流管组, 说明放置引流管对早期预防血肿形成有利。

放置引流管会使切口内血肿填塞作用消失、切口内压力下降进而导致术后显性失血增加, 隐性失血减少; 而不放置引流管因关节腔隙相对封闭, 术后出血积聚在关节腔内, 使关节腔内压力增高, 压迫出血的微小血管, 从而使术后的显性失血减少, 但隐性失血明显增加, 理论上失血总量并不会有很大差异<sup>[25]</sup>。本研究中 2 组患者理论失血总量及输血率比较差异均无统计学意义, 也印证了上述观点, 这与 Märdian 等<sup>[26]</sup>的研究结果也类似。Hb 常被用作临床上失血的参数, 我们的研究结果显示不管是否放置引流管, 2 组患者术后不同时间点 Hb 下降值比较, 差异均无统计学意义。在本研究中, 细致的止血操作贯穿于整个手术过程, 止血带只是在安装骨水泥假体的短时间内

表 6 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的膝关节屈曲度

组别	样本量 (例)	膝关节屈曲度( $\bar{x} \pm s, ^\circ$ )						F 值	P 值
		术后 1 d	术后 3 d	术后 6 d	术后 1 个月	术后 1 年	合计		
引流管组	35	87.80 ± 4.92	44.09 ± 5.52	67.09 ± 4.18	81.51 ± 6.24	103.34 ± 6.18	77.77 ± 20.83	636.930	0.000
非引流管组	35	86.34 ± 5.32	49.02 ± 5.56	69.29 ± 5.07	83.03 ± 5.37	104.46 ± 5.17	78.43 ± 19.27	561.441	0.000
合计	70	87.07 ± 5.14	46.56 ± 6.04	81.51 ± 6.24	82.27 ± 5.83	103.90 ± 5.68	77.60 ± 20.05	1 196.369 <sup>1)</sup>	0.000 <sup>1)</sup>
检验统计量		1.190	-3.734	-1.981	-1.089	-0.818	6.676 <sup>1)</sup>	$F=3.402^{2)}, P=0.011^{2)}$	
P 值		0.238	0.000	0.052	0.280	0.416	0.012 <sup>1)</sup>		

1) 主效应的 F 值和 P 值; 2) 交互效应的 F 值和 P 值

表 7 2 组中重度膝骨关节炎患者的美国膝关节协会评分

组别	样本量(例)	美国膝关节协会评分( $\bar{x} \pm s$ , 分)		t 值	P 值
		术前	术后 1 年		
引流管组	35	67.00 ± 4.32	159.85 ± 5.93	-85.886	0.000
非引流管组	35	66.23 ± 4.77	160.57 ± 6.81	-81.456	0.000
t 值		0.710	-0.468		
P 值		0.480	0.641		

使用,髓腔开口使用自体骨填塞,同时切口内局部使用氨甲环酸,这些操作均对控制术后出血及失血总量有直接影响。此外,术后 1 d、3 d、6 d 和 1 年 2 组患者膝关节疼痛 VAS 评分比较,差异均无统计学意义。可见不采用引流装置并不会增加患者术后疼痛,而且对患者膝关节早期功能锻炼及快速康复并无阻碍。

有研究表明<sup>[21]</sup>,不同骨科手术后留置创面引流可防止术后血肿的形成,从而降低感染率。但也有学者报道<sup>[23,27]</sup>骨科手术后留置创面引流可能会因引流物逆行至切口而致感染率增加。在本研究中,2 组患者均无手术相关感染情况的发生,且 2 组并发症发生率比较,差异无统计学意义。

本研究结果显示,在中重度膝骨关节炎初次全膝关节置换术后不放置引流管,能早期改善膝关节活动度,并发症少,虽然对早期预防血肿形成不利,但对膝关节疼痛缓解和膝关节功能恢复无明显影响,有利于术后快速康复的实施。

## 5 参考文献

- [1] KEHLET H, WILMORE D W. Multimodal strategies to improve surgical outcome [J]. *Am J Surg*, 2002, 183 (6): 630 - 641.
- [2] HUSTED H. Fast-track hip and knee arthroplasty: clinical and organizational aspects [J]. *Acta Orthop Suppl*, 2012, 83 (346): 1 - 39.
- [3] JIANG F Z, ZHONG H M, HONG Y C, et al. Use of a tourniquet in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials [J]. *J Orthop Sci*, 2015, 20 (1): 110 - 123.
- [4] YI S, TAN J, CHEN C, et al. The use of pneumatic tourniquet in total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis [J]. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*, 2014, 134 (10): 1469 - 1476.
- [5] ZHANG W, LI N, CHEN S, et al. The effects of a tourniquet used in total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis [J]. *J Orthop Surg Res*, 2014, 9 (1): 13.
- [6] 中华医学会骨科学分会. 骨关节炎诊治指南 (2007 年版) [J]. *中华骨科杂志*, 2007, 27 (10): 793 - 796.
- [7] 杨建平, 蒋涛, 吕正祥. 止血带优化对全膝关节置换术快速康复的影响 [J]. *中国矫形外科杂志*, 2018, 26 (1): 29 - 33.
- [8] 蒋协远, 王大伟. 骨科临床疗效评价标准 [M]. 北京: 人民卫生出版社, 2005: 123 - 124.
- [9] INSALL J N, DORR L D, SCOTT R D, et al. Rationale of the knee society clinical rating system [J]. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*, 1989, (248): 13 - 14.
- [10] HU Y, LI Q, WEI B G, et al. Blood loss of total knee arthroplasty in osteoarthritis: an analysis of influential factors [J]. *J Orthop Surg Res*, 2018, 13 (1): 325.
- [11] MAY J H, RIESER G R, WILLIAMS C G. The assessment of blood loss during total knee arthroplasty when comparing intravenous vs intracapsular administration of tranexamic acid [J]. *J Arthroplasty*, 2016, 31 (11): 2452 - 2457.
- [12] CARR A J, ROBERTSSON O, GRAVES S, et al. Knee replacement [J]. *Lancet*, 2012, 379 (9823): 1331 - 1340.
- [13] 郝瑞胡, 郭林, 李丽丽, 等. 全膝关节置换术治疗膝关节炎性关节炎的临床观察 [J]. *中国骨与关节损伤杂志*, 2014, 29 (6): 544 - 546.
- [14] HUANG Y, LEE M, CHONG H C, et al. Reasons and factors behind post-total knee arthroplasty dissatisfaction in an Asian population [J]. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*, 2017, 46 (8): 303 - 309.
- [15] DEN HERTOOG A, GLIESCHE K, TIMM J A, et al. Pathway-controlled fast-track rehabilitation after total knee arthroplasty: a randomized prospective clinical study evaluating the recovery pattern, drug consumption, and length of stay [J]. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*, 2012, 132 (8): 1153 - 1163.
- [16] 孙京涛, 刘宏建, 魏瑄, 等. 电针联合三七消肿止痛散外敷在全膝关节置换术后快速康复中的应用 [J]. *中医正骨*, 2017, 29 (3): 10 - 13.
- [17] CASTORINA S, GUGLIELMINO C, CASTROGIOVANNI P, et al. Clinical evidence of traditional vs fast track recovery methodologies after total arthroplasty for osteoarthritic knee treatment. A retrospective observational study [J]. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J*, 2018, 7 (3): 504 - 513.
- [18] GROMOV K, KRISTENSEN B B, JØRGENSEN C C, et al. Fast-track total knee arthroplasty [J]. *Ugeskr Laeger*, 2017, 179 (38): pii: V04170300.
- [19] 孟涛, 石辉, 刘明廷, 等. 快速康复外科在单侧全膝关节置换术中的应用 [J]. *中国矫形外科杂志*, 2015, 23 (19): 1768 - 1773.
- [20] 景峰, 李慧敏, 杨旭东, 等. 人工膝关节置换术后放置引流管的疗效及安全性分析 [J]. *中华医学杂志*, 2017, 97 (27): 2145 - 2149.
- [21] SIMONS M J, AMIN N H, SCUDERI G R. Acute wound complications after total knee arthroplasty: prevention and management [J]. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*, 2017, 25 (8): 547 - 555.
- [22] PARKER M J, ROBERTS C P, HAY D. Closed suction drainage for hip and knee arthroplasty. A meta-analysis [J].

- J Bone Joint Surg Am, 2004, 86(6): 1146 – 1152.
- [23] DEMIRKALE I, TECIMEL O, SESEN H, et al. Nondrainage decreases blood transfusion need and infection rate in bilateral total knee arthroplasty [J]. J Arthroplasty, 2014, 29(5): 993 – 997.
- [24] WANG G, WANG D, WANG B, et al. Efficacy and safety evaluation of intra-articular injection of tranexamic acid in total knee arthroplasty operation with temporarily drainage close [J]. Int J Clin Exp Med, 2015, 8(8): 14328 – 14334.
- [25] 陶坤, 吴海山, 李晓华, 等. 闭式引流在全膝关节置换术中的作用评价 [J]. 中华外科杂志, 2006, 44(16): 1111 – 1114.
- [26] MÄRDIAN S, MATZIOLIS G, SCHWABE P. Influence of wound drainage in primary total knee arthroplasty without tourniquet [J]. Int Orthop, 2015, 39(3): 435 – 440.
- [27] AL-ZAHID S, DAVIES A P. Closed suction drains, reinfusion drains or no drains in primary total knee replacement? [J]. Ann R Coll Surg Engl, 2012, 94(5): 347 – 350.
- (收稿日期: 2019-02-13 本文编辑: 时红磊)
- (上接第 6 页)
- [11] SHOWALTER B L, BECKSTEIN J C, MARTIN J T, et al. Comparison of animal discs used in disc research to human lumbar disc torsion mechanics and collagen content [J]. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2012, 37(15): E900 – 907.
- [12] ZHANG J, WANG X, LIU H, et al. TNF- $\alpha$  enhances apoptosis by promoting chop expression in nucleus pulposus cells: role of the MAPK and NF- $\kappa$ B pathways [J]. J Orthop Res, 2019, 37(3): 697 – 705.
- [13] YANG B, O'CONNELL G D. GAG content, fiber stiffness, and fiber angle affect swelling-based residual stress in the intact annulus fibrosus [J]. Biomech Model Mechanobiol, 2018 Dec 10. doi: 10.1007/s10237-018-1105-9. [Epub ahead of print]
- [14] CHE Y J, GUO J B, LIANG T, et al. Controlled immobilization-traction based on intervertebral stability is conducive to the regeneration or repair of the degenerative disc: An in vivo study on the rat coccygeal model [J]. Spine J, 2018 Nov 3. pii: S1529-9430(18)31204-X. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2018.10.018. [Epub ahead of print]
- [15] SAKAI D, NISHIMURA K, TANAKA M A, et al. Migration of bone marrow-derived cells for endogenous repair in a new tail-looping disc degeneration model in the mouse: a pilot study [J]. Spine J, 2015, 15(6): 1356 – 1365.
- [16] PAPUGA M O, KWOK E, YOU Z, et al. TNF is required for the induction but not the maintenance of compression-induced BME signals in murine tail vertebrae: limitations of anti-TNF therapy for degenerative disc disease [J]. J Orthop Res, 2011, 29(9): 1367 – 1374.
- [17] HSIEH A H, LOTZ J C. Prolonged spinal loading induces matrix metalloproteinase-2 activation in intervertebral discs [J]. Spine (Phila Pa), 2003, 28(16): 1781 – 1788.
- [18] COURT C, COLLIU O K, CHIN J R, et al. The effect of static in vivo bending on the murine intervertebral disc [J]. Spine J, 2001, 1(4): 239 – 245.
- [19] ZHOU H, SHEN J, HU Z, et al. Leukemia inhibitory factor promotes extracellular matrix synthesis in degenerative nucleus pulposus cells via MAPK-ERK1/2 signaling pathway [J]. Biochem Biophys Res Commun, 2018, 507(1-4): 253 – 259.
- [20] MARRAS W S, LAVENDER S A, LEURGANS S E, et al. Biomechanical risk factors for occupationally related low back disorders [J]. Ergonomics, 1995, 38(2): 377 – 410.
- [21] DU S, SUN Y, ZHAO B. Interleukin-6 serum levels are elevated in individuals with degenerative cervical myelopathy and are correlated with symptom severity [J]. Med Sci Monit, 2018, 24: 7405 – 7413.
- [22] TAM W K, CHEUNG K M, LEUNG V Y. Intervertebral disc engineering through exploiting mesenchymal stem cells: progress and perspective [J]. Curr Stem Cell Res Ther, 2016, 11(6): 505 – 512.
- [23] ALLON A A, AUROUER N, YOO B B, et al. Structured coculture of stem cells and disc cells prevent disc degeneration in a rat model [J]. Spine J, 2010, 10(12): 1089 – 1097.
- [24] CHAN D D, KHAN S N, YE X, et al. Mechanical deformation and glycosaminoglycan content changes in a rabbit annular puncture disc degeneration model [J]. Spine (Phila Pa 1976), 2011, 36(18): 1438 – 1445.
- [25] DALY C D, GHOSH P, BADAL T, et al. A comparison of two ovine lumbar intervertebral disc injury models for the evaluation and development of novel regenerative therapies [J]. Global Spine J, 2018, 8(8): 847 – 859.
- [26] LAO Y J, XU T T, JIN H T, et al. Accumulated spinal axial biomechanical loading induces degeneration in intervertebral disc of mice lumbar spine [J]. Orthop Surg, 2018, 10(1): 56 – 63.
- [27] 黄秀芳, 原向伟. Sox9 和 II 型胶原蛋白在腰椎间盘突出中的表达及意义 [J]. 中国医药科学, 2014, 4(3): 18 – 21.
- (收稿日期: 2019-01-05 本文编辑: 时红磊)