## Treatment of Periprosthetic Infection after Total Knee Arthroplasty using an Ultrastatic Spacer

Gloria Coden MD, Maksym Bartashevskyy BA, Suzanne Kent MD, Zachary Berliner MD, Ruijia Niu MPH, David Freccero MD, James Bono MD, Ayesha Abdeen MD, Eric L. Smith MD

Beth Israel Lahey Health 💙

BU Chobanian & Avedisian School of Medicine New England Baptist Hospital



EXCEPTIONAL CARE. WITHOUT EXCEPTION.

## Disclosures

- Gloria Coden, MD: Editorial or governing board: The Journal of Orthopaedic Experience & Innovation
- Maksym Bartashevskyy, BA: None
- Suzanne Kent, MD: None
- Zachary Berliner, MD: None
- Ruijia Niu, MPH: None
- David Freccero, MD:
  - Board or committee member: AAOS, AAHKS
  - Research support: Conformis, Depuy A
    Johnson & Johnson Company
  - Stock or stock Options: ROMTech



- James Bono, MD:
  - Publishing royalties, financial or material support: Springer
  - Paid consultant; Paid presenter or speaker: Stryker
  - IP royalties: Stryker, Sectra
- Ayesha Abdeen, MD: Board or committee member: AAOS, AAHKS
- Eric L. Smith, MD:
  - Board or committee member: AAOS, AAHKS
  - Paid consultant: Conformis, DePuy, A
     Johnson & Johnson Company
  - Paid presenter or speaker: Pacira
  - Research support: 3M, Conformis,
  - DePuy, A Johnson & Johnson Company
  - Stock or stock Options: Conformis

## Introduction

- Prosthetic Joint Infection (PJI) is a Devastating Complication after Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA)<sup>1</sup>
- Static Antibiotic Spacer is Crucial in the setting of:1
  - Significant Bone Loss
  - Ligament Laxity
  - Failure of Extensor Mechanism
- Single Nail Constructs may cause Stress Risers and Fracture<sup>2-3</sup>
  - Especially in Poor Bone Quality
- **Goal:** Describe our Technique and Evaluate Outcomes when using an Ultrastatic Spacer to treat PJI after TKA





## **Methods**



- Retrospectively Reviewed 11 patients who underwent placement of an Ultrastatic Spacer between 7/2/2020 and 10/3/2022 for PJI after TKA
- All Patients also received Organism-Specific Systemic Antibiotics
- Data collected included Demographics, Complications, and Outcomes Table 1. Demographics

Age (years), mean62.8 (55-72)Male, n (%)9 (81.8%)Indication, n (%)10 (90.9%)Positive Preoperative and/or Intraoperative Cultures10 (90.9%)Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan1 (9.1%)Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)		n=11
Male, n (%)9 (81.8%)Indication, n (%)10 (90.9%)Positive Preoperative and/or Intraoperative Cultures10 (90.9%)Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan1 (9.1%)Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)	Age (years), mean	62.8 (55-72)
Indication, n (%)10 (90.9%)Positive Preoperative and/or Intraoperative Cultures10 (90.9%)Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan1 (9.1%)Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)(range)1.3 (0.3-2.3)	Male, n (%)	9 (81.8%)
Positive Preoperative and/or Intraoperative Cultures10 (90.9%)Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan1 (9.1%)Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)(range)1.3 (0.3-2.3)	Indication, n (%)	
Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan1 (9.1%)Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)(range)1.3 (0.3-2.3)	Positive Preoperative and/or Intraoperative Cultures	10 (90.9%)
Operative Time (hours), mean (range)3.3 (2.5-5.0)Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)(range)	Positive Indium-White Blood Cell Scan	1 (9.1%)
Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)212.5 (134-502)Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean1.3 (0.3-2.3)(range)	Operative Time (hours), mean (range)	3.3 (2.5-5.0)
Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean 1.3 (0.3-2.3) (range)	Time Ultrastatic Spacer Implanted (days), mean (range)	212.5 (134-502)
(range)	Follow-Up From Placement of Ultrastatic Spacer (years), mean	1.3 (0.3-2.3)
	(range)	





## Technique



#### Retrograde Femoral and Antegrade Tibial Nail that Overlap to Span Knee





## **Technique**



Nails Tied Together using 16-Gauge Wire





## **Technique**



#### Antibiotic Cement Hand Impacted Into Bone Defects and to Span Knee

## **Postoperative Protocol**





- Weight Bearing as Tolerated
- Knee Immobilizer until Proprioception Regained
- Routine Venous Thromboembolism
   Prophylaxis
- Culture-Specific Systemic Antibiotics per Board-Certified Infectious Disease Physician



## **Results**

#### Table 2. Outcomes

	n=11
Outcomes, n (%)	
Cleared PJI and underwent	3 (27.3%)
revision TKA	
Permanent Fusion with	2 (18.2%)
Modular Arthrodesis	
<b>Revised to Different Arthrodesis</b>	2 (18.2%)
<b>Construct for Persistent Infection</b>	
Unable to Clear Infection and	1 (9.1%)
underwent Amputation	
Ultrastatic Spacer In Place at	3 (27.3%)
Most Recent Follow-Up	
Periprosthetic Fractures	0 (0.0%)







## Conclusion





- Ultrastatic Spacers provide Stable Fixation for PJI after TKA
- No Periprosthetic Fractures
- Surgeons should be aware that Ultrastatic Spacers are Viable Option for Treatment of PJI with
  - Significant Bone Loss
  - Ligament Laxity
  - Failure of Extensor Mechanism
- Surgeons should be aware of Technique for Implantation



# Thank You







EXCEPTIONAL CARE. WITHOUT EXCEPTION.



## References

1. Elsharkawy KA, Talmo CJ. Use of an Antibiotic-Impregnated Spacer in Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty. In: Bono J, Scott R editors Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty, Cham: Springer; 2018, p. 401-14.

2. Pivec R, Naziri Q, Issa K, Banerjee S, Mont MA. Systematic review comparing static and articulating spacers used for revision of infected total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. 2014;29(3):553-7.e1.

3. Faschingbauer M, Bieger R, Reichel H, Weiner C, Kappe T. Complications associated with 133 static, antibiotic-laden spacers after TKA. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2016;24(10):3096-3099.