

Ste 44 - 1480 Foster Street White Rock, BC V4B 3X7 Telephone: 604 . 538 . 0068 Fax: 604 . 538 . 0703 Email: frontdesk@wrosc.com www.drarnosmit.com

ARNO SMIT, M.D., F.R.C.S.(C)

ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEON

Unicompartmental gonarthrosis \rightarrow

'numbers can help'

Juan de Fuca Meeting Victoria, BC May 15, 2010

Outline

Introduction of decision analysis tool

- Application of decision analysis tool:
 - to assess relative merit of current
 technology → UKA vs TKA
 - to assess potential risks/benefits of new technology

Introduction

Evidence based surgical decision making:

- Multiple variables and parameters
- Ranges of reported outcomes
- Various sources of evidence

Individual surgeon belief system

- Belief system continuously updated and modified
- Multiple permutations: intuitive assessment difficult

- Cohort decision analysis
- assume 100 patients
- age 60 y
- end-stage anteromedial gonarthrosis
- define initial and subsequent procedures
- quantify procedure related parameters
- assume linear procedure attrition rate
- assume mortality of 2.5 % per year

- each revision creates a new sub-cohort
- each sub-cohort has a linear attrition rate
- tabulate various procedures: determine total cohort morbidity determine cohort resource utilization



- Current model:
 - intervals user defined
 - user defined cap on revision number
 - → 'salvage'
 - allows more flexibility
- Initial modelling suggested: 70 % 10 y implant survival of UKA would yield similar hospital utilization and infection rate as TKR

- Group of 8 orthopaedic surgeons
- Decision analysis model discussed
- Consensus:
- linear attrition rate was realistic.
- revision of UKR -> TKA is similar to primary TKA.
- 2nd and higher total knee revisions could be lumped together.
- outcomes & resource utilization defined

Results: surgeons' consensus

		10 y attrition(%)	cost(\$)	hosp (days)	infection
•	UKR	10%	\$11,000	1	0.5%
•	TKR	5%	\$13,400	3	1%
•	U ->TKR	5%	\$13,400	3	1%
•	TKA R1	15%	\$17,500	4	3%
•	TKA R>1	25%	\$20,000	7	5%

Results: cohort decision analysis

Primary procedure UKA

Primary procedure TKA

Procedures	115	108
Cost, excl infections	\$ 1,299,558	\$ 1,492,763
Hospital days	145	336
Infections	0.66	1.27

Discussion

UKR is a valid option for treatment of medial compartment gonarthrosis, as assessed by this group of BC surgeons, based on consideration of reduced cost, hospitalization and total infection burden, despite a higher re-operation rate.

UKA vs TKA:

- Decision analysis/ cohort modelling allows assessment of implications of surgeon's perception of relevant outcome parameters
- Results of cohort modelling after consensus seeking confirm that UKA as primary treatment for medial OA of the knee can reduce cost, cohort infection and hospital utilization, despite a higher number of total procedures.

Additional considerations:

• Unloading bracing:

assuming 20% per year attrition rate, uncomplicated conversion to UKA

- \rightarrow favourable
- HTO:

'for another day'

Assessment of new treatment options

- Clinical outcome not known
- Range of possible outcomes can be assessed
- May help establish preliminary balance between risks and benefits
- May help anticipate resource utilization

Example: Metallic interpositional arthroplasty

Historical background:

- → MacIntosh, McKeever
- \rightarrow Sbarbaro, Swanson
- used initially in OA and RA
- as far back as late 1950's
- required some bone preparation

Metallic interpositional arthroplasty

- Unispacer (Sulzer, Zimmer)
- brief period of interest in early 2000's
- quick, relatively wide acceptance by US surgeons
- scarcely reported on
- issues: implant instability, overstuffing (?), arthrofibrosis
- relied on femoral congruency for stability
- 1 year revision rates ? 20-30% ?

Unispacer



Metallic interpositional arthroplasty

Contemporary use:

- Dr. R. Scott, Boston
- 'may be considered as a bridging measure in the treatment of unicompartmental OA'
- 70-86% implant survival at 8 y \rightarrow not unlike HTO
- 10 out of 24 doing well at 16 years
- McKeever

- Development history
 - 2003 trial of a polyurethane interpositional arthroplasty (Advanced BioSurfaces)
- Minimally invasive procedure
- Stable implant
- Initial recovery OK
- Synovitis due to wear after 2-3 months
- Trial stopped

- Development history:
- Evaluation of lessons learned
- Metallic implants made of same configuration
- 3 and 4 mm implants, various AP sizes
- early experience reported in 2007 (300 implants, 92 patients with functional scores, mainly USA, Arnold)
- 10% revision rate at 1 y, functional scores acceptable, WOMAC 32 → 72 at 6m, 1/300 dislocation, 1/300 infection.
- To date: approximately 500 implants placed

Orthoglide - medial



- Considerations for community orthopod:
- Is it safe?
- Is it effective?
- What about long-term management?
- Is it acceptable to the health care system?
- Cost and other resource utilization?
- Health Canada licencing status?

- Medial implant licenced by HPB, lateral implant licenced in US and Europe, Special Access in Canada.
- Safety:
- potentially minimally invasive surgery
- potentially minimal hospital stay
- No violation of subchondral bone → potentially 'reversible' (management of infection etc)

- Assume following range of parameters for medial Orthoglide:
- Revision rate 5% or 10% per year
- Revision
 - to UKA, no compromise
 - to primary TKA, no compromise
- Daycare surgery under local anesthesia with IV sedation
- Infection rate 0.5% (same as UKA) or 0.25%
- Treatment of infection: removal of implant with IV antibiotics.

- Current working assumptions
- Infection rate $\frac{1}{2}$ of UKA \rightarrow 0.25%
- Revision rate 5% per year
- Revision to UKA (for majority)
- Function at 1 y similar to UKA / TKA

Orthoglide: outcome analysis over 20 years

(5% / year revision, mortality 2.5% / year, revision to UKA)

	OG	UKA
 Total procedures 	176	115
 Hospital days 	93	145
 Infection rate 	0.67	0.66

Orthoglide - medial















What if expected lifespan is short?

- 82 y old female with lateral OA / RA
- Evaluated for TKA
- CXR \rightarrow lung carcinoma
- Experimental chemo
- Immuno compromised
- Frail
- Pain +++, depressed +++

Lateral Orthoglide: 82 y old female with lateral OA / RA







82 y old female with lateral OA / RA



82 y old female with lateral OA / RA PARR





82 y old female with lateral OA / RA 10 w postop



- Current practice:
- 'ideal' candidate for UKA \rightarrow usually Oxford
- 'too early' or 'not well enough' for TKA, but 'not ideal' for Oxford → consider Orthoglide
- If strong patient preference → take into consideration (tolerance for uncertainty of effectiveness of implant, exposure to surgical risk vary widely).
- INFORMED CONSENT of high quality

- Early results:
- Gradual introduction as of July 2009
- Total as of May 1, 2010:
 - n=20 medial
 - n=3 lateral
- Arthoscopically assisted, local anesthesia with IV sedation, day care surgery
- One hematoma, washed out, good so far

- Initial assessment
- medial Orthoglide arthroplasty appears safe and can be effective
- uncertainty persists re. consistency and extent of functional improvement
- revision options are preserved
- this may be a surgical tool to reduce overall patient risk when managing unicompartmental OA

Conclusion

- Decision analysis / cohort analysis can assist in surgical decision making
- This type of approach may help when assessing
 - the relative merits of established technology
 - the potential value of new technology

THANK YOU