Does the type of Knee Replacement impact early postoperative pain?

A retrospective analysis of three Total Knee Systems

LSK PS knee pain relief precocity and superiority in the first 12 weeks post-op vs two competitive knees

Dr. Russell T. Nevins

Desert Orthopaedic Center Las Vegas, United States

Introduction

Traditional evaluation of TKAs' success is based on surgeon-objectively-measured metrics such as Kaplan-Meier survivorship, Hazard ratios, revision besides radiographic assessment rates, and alignment/ROM. Contemporary TKAs are offering more than excellent survivorship being a well-proven procedure with more than 80% surviving at 25yrs f-u.¹ An emerging trend in Orthopaedics to measure TKAs' in-vivo outcomes complementing this objective approach is relying on subjective PROMs' collection,^{2,3} given the relatively high quota of post-operative dissatisfaction⁴ recorded even in unrevised patients^{5,6} and the residual pain following TKAs, even on younger patients7,8,6 which challenges the definition of "a successful TKA", given also the sometimes different criteria patients' vs physicians are adopting to judge and measure "success" based on different expectations.^{6,9-11} PROMs see today a widespread adoption by the majority of the international NJRs¹²⁻¹⁶ and growing publication rate¹⁷⁻¹⁹ when used as endpoints in clinical trials,²⁰ and work is ongoing to harmonize their usage to allow comparability.21,22 Their predictive value has been even recently demonstrated.^{23,24} When releasing a new TKA system

in the market is therefore crucial to collect also the unbiassed voices of the patients to validate its clinical effectiveness.²⁵ This urgency holds true especially in the immediate follow-up, during the rehabilitation, a challenging phase where patients have to recover as quickly as possible setting the basis for future mobility, confidence (QoL) and associated satisfaction in time to come as well as excellent survivorship, which typically is not reported before 6 m to 12 m in the international NJRs, leaving the most critical rehabilitation phase poorly investigated, but still so strategically important for the patients. Evidences show in fact as persistent post-operative pain following TKAs still remains a large issue^{5,26} impacting 15% to 34% of patients even after 2 to 5 yrs post-op.²⁷ At once the Pain relief precocity in the first weeks (2 w to 8 w)^{28,29} of immediate post-op is crucial for the functional recovery and satisfaction later on seen in the follow-up at 6m to 2yrs^{30,31} and for the Pain relief itself at 3m to 6m.³² Fast pain responders may be identified very soon based on their pain trajectories in the immediate post-op and assessed for their impact on Pain relief and PROMs in the follow-up to come.

Methods and Design

Single surgeon, 2 centres, retrospective review comparing **pain relief and painkillers** (opioid) dose up to 12 weeks post-operatively between 3 contem-

porary different primary TKAs implanted following the same surgical technique on comparable demographics arms (for age/gender/BMI/diagnosis) at baseline.

Timepoint

Focus **on the immediate recovery period**, as the most critical, from 2 weeks to 12 weeks post-op also collecting data at 6 weeks f-u.



Implants used

299 TKAs in total performed from June 2020 to March 2022, distributed as in the table below, well-balanced arms.

The three TKAs represented different constrains (i.e. CR/UC/PS), kinematics (fixed vs mobile bearing) and fixations (i.e. fully cemented LinkSymphoKnee,

hybrid Evolution Medial-Pivot, uncemented PFC Sigma RPCR) but the 3 arms exhibited no statistically-significant differences in pre-operative covariates and same surgical technique was used (i.e. tourniquet ad median parapatellar approach).

Primary Knee Brand	N (knees)
LinkSymphoKnee PS, Waldemar Link	94
Evolution Medial-Pivot, Microport Orthopedics	104
PFC Sigma RP CR, Johnson & Johnson MedTech	101

Study goal

The study goal is twofold: to identify which TKA offers

- 1. The largest Pain relief (change vs pre-op) and painkillers dose reduction
- 2. The quickest Pain relief and painkillers dose reduction

So quantity & rate are the key study objectives.

Primary endpoint: PROM- scale NRS Pain 0 to 10 at pre-op, 2w,6w,12w

Secondary endpoint: average daily dose of prescribed opioids (expressed as MME milligram morphine equivalent) at 2w,6w,12w only on opioid-naïve-patients (i.e not prescribed or using opioids 30 days prior to surgery, for each group 77 LSK PS, 89 MP, and 75 RP).

Results

Pain relief

A statistically-significant different pain relief vs pre-op baseline was observed at 2w and at 6w for the LSK PS vs both MP and RP TKAs, with LSK PS able to offer

larger and quicker pain relief (23% vs 7-8% of RP/MP at 2weeks and 48% vs 28-29% for MP/RP at 6 weeks vs pre-op)

The bar charts below show % Pain relief achieved by knee brand at different timepoints vs pre-op.



NRS Pain by knee brand with f-u

Pain relief reached a plateau at 12 weeks f-u being the difference not any longer statistically-significantly different as normal with time differences were reducing among TKAs systems.

IMPORTANT TO NOTE:

The benefit of LSK PS was brought exactly in the immediate f-u 2w to 6w **where it matters strategically more** for a patient own recovery/QoL restoration and mobility's confidence.

Painkillers reduction

A similar trend was found for the painkiller dose reduction, with LSK PS demonstrating a statisticallysignificant lower avrg opioid dose vs both MP and RP at 2w and at 6w f-u continuing offering a 78% reduction of painkillers at 12w vs 2w. The downhill painkiller dose trend was inversely correlated with an uphill Pain relief as logically expected. Once again **the precocity** of Painkillers reduction was important vs competitors, meaning LSK PS patients not only needed a lower dose since the immediate post-op (largest % reduction -35% at 2w, -32% at 6w, -56% at 12w) but also reduced their doses **quicker** vs competitive knees



Painkillers dose (avrg MME mg/day) by knee brand





Benchmark LSK PS vs competitors

These data allow also a benchmarking of the LSK PROMs performances **at the shortest follow-up** vs either contemporary state-of-the-art knees, such as the Evolution MP, or vs long-time-validated primary

knee systems such as RP Sigma CR. The % Pain relief offered by LSK PS vs competitors at 2w/6w/12w vs pre-op is in fig. below:



LSK already at 2 weeks f-u can relief x 3 the post-op Pain vs Evolution Medial-Pivot

	🦉 LSK PS	5 vs PFC Sigma RP CR 🎉	
	2w vs pre-op	280%	
	6w vs pre-op	100%	
	12w vs pre-op	44%	
	% pain relief	0 100 200	300

LSK already at 2 weeks f-u can relief nearly x 4 the Pain vs the PFC Sigma RP CR

% avrg pain relief offered by LSK PS vs competitors

Does the type of Knee Replacement impact early postoperative pain? A retrospective analysis of three Total Knee Systems

The 2w to 12w range of painkillers dose reduction range is shown in Fig. below:

Painkillers reduction - % reduction offered by LSK PS vs competitors between 2w to 12w f-u

LSK PS vs Evolution Medial-Pivot

LSK PS vs PFC Sigma RP CR



Conclusion

LSK PS significantly **outperformed at the shortestterm** follow-up during rehab two state-of-the-art contemporary knee systems being able to offer a **larger and quicker** Pain relief and associated Painkillers dose reduction. With less pain immediately recorded in the first weeks post-op, patient confidence and mobility can be increased having set the basis also for sustained pain relief in the months and years to come^{33,34}, allowing an earlier recovery, theoretically allowing shorter Length Of Stay (LOS) and larger outpatient TKAs quota, crucial points in the current value-based healthcare scenario driven by patients' satisfaction maximization and resources' optimization at once. LSK PS has the potential, based on these PROMS study findings, of offering therefore significant values to patients and health care practitioners without having to wait too long for this value to impact patients' Quality of Life.

Further studies in the future, with larger cohorts, are deemed necessary to throughfully investigate the reasons behind this promising short-term results and offer more clinical insights.



References

- 1 Ewans JT et al., How long does a knee replacement last? A systematic review and meta-analysis of case series and national registry reports with more than 15 years of follow-up, Lancet 2019 ;393(10172):655-663.
- 2 Rolfson O et al., The use of patient-reported outcomes after routine arthroplasty- beyond the whys and the ifs, Bone Joint J 2015;97-B:578–81.
- 3 rRamkumar PN et al., Patient-reported outcome measures after total knee arthroplasty, Bone Joint Res 2015;4:120–127.
- 4 Robertsson O et al., Patient satisfaction after knee arthroplasty: a report on 27,372 knees operated on between 1981 and 1995 in Sweden. Acta Orthop Scand 2000;71(3):262-7.
- 5 Price AJ et al., Are pain and function better measures of outcome than revision rates after TKR in the younger patient? Knee 2010;17(3):196-9.
- 6 Goodfellow JW et al., A critique of revision rate as an outcome measure: re-interpretation of knee joint registry data, J Bone Joint Surg Br 2010;92(12):1628-31.
- 7 Parvizi J et al., High level of residual symptoms in young patients after total knee arthroplasty, Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472(1):133-7.
- 8 Scott CEH et al., Predicting dissatisfaction following total knee arthroplasty in patients under 55 years of age. Bone Joint J 2016;98-B(12):1625-1634.
- 9 Bullens PH et al., Patient satisfaction after total knee arthroplasty: a comparison between subjective and objective outcome assessments J Arthroplasty 2001;16-6:740-7.
- 10 Ghomrawi HMK et al, Discordance in TKA expectations between patients and surgeons. CORR 2013 ;471-1:175-80.
- 11 Wang Y et al., Patient-reported outcome measures used in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty. Bone Joint Res 2021;10(3):203–217.
- 12 Prodinger B et al., Improving quality of care through patient reported outcome measures (PROMs): expert interviews using the NHS PROMs Programme and the Swedish quality registers for knee and hip arthroplasty as examples. BMC Health Services Research (2018) 18:87.
- 13 Wilson I et al., Orthopaedic registries with patient-reported outcome measures. EFORT Open Rev. 2019; 4(6): 357–367.
- 14 Rolfson O et al., Patient-reported outcome measures in arthroplasty registries Report of the Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Working Group of the International Society of Arthroplasty Registries. Part II. Recommendations for selection, administration, and analysis. Acta Orthopaedica 2016; 87 (eSuppl 362): 9–23.
- 15 Malchau H et al., Arthroplasty Implant Registries Over the Past Five Decades: Development, Current, and Future Impact. J Orthop Res 2018;36(9):2319-2330.
- 16 Bohm ER et al., Collection and Reporting of Patient-reported Outcome Measures in Arthroplasty Registries: Multinational Survey and Recommendations, Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2021 479(10): 2151–2166.
- 17 Lan RH et al., Evolving Outcome Measures in Total Knee Arthroplasty: Trends and Utilization Rates Over the Past 15 Years. J Arthroplasty 2020;35(11):3375-3382.
- 18 Vajapey SP et al. Outcome reporting patterns in total knee arthroplasty: A systematic review. J Clin Orthop Trauma. 2020; 11(Suppl 4): S464–S471.

- 19 Siljander MP et al., Current Trends in Patient-Reported Outcome Measures in Total Joint Arthroplasty: A Study of 4 Major Orthopaedic Journals. J Arthroplasty 2018 ;33(11):3416-3421.
- 20 Reiter CR et al., Patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) as primary and secondary outcomes in total hip and knee arthroplasty randomized controlled trials: a systematic review, Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 2024;144(5):2257-2266
- 21 Rolfson O et al 2016. "Defining an International Standard Set of Outcome Measures for Patients With Hip or Knee Osteoarthritis: Consensus of the International Consortium for Health Outcomes Measurement Hip and Knee Osteoarthritis Working Group." Arthritis Care & Research 68 (11): 1631-1639.
- 22 Ingelsrud LH et al., How do Patient-reported Outcomes Scores in International Hip and Knee Arthroplasty Registries compare? Clin Orthop Relat Res (2022) 480:1884-1896.
- 23 Andersen JD et al., Development of a multivariable prediction model for early revision of total knee arthroplasty – The effect of including patient-reported outcome measures, J Orthop. 2021; 24: 216–221.
- 24 Ackerman IN et al., Poor Knee-specific and Generic Patientreported Outcome Measure Scores at 6 Months Are Associated With Early Revision Knee Arthroplasty: A Study From the Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry, Clin Orthop Relat Res (2022) 480:1899-1909.
- 25 Makhni EC et al., Meaningful Clinical Applications of Patient-Reported OutcomeMeasures in Orthopaedics. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2021 Jan 6;103(1):84-9.
- 26 Grosu I et al., Pain after knee arthroplasty: an unresolved issue; Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 2014;22(8):1744-58.
- 27 Wylde V et al., Persistent pain after joint replacement: prevalence, sensory qualities, and postoperative determinants. Pain. 2011;152(3):566-572.
- 28 Singh JA et al., Association of Early Postoperative Pain Trajectories With Longer-term Pain Outcome After Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty JAMA Netw Open 2019 Nov 1;2(11):e1915105.
- 29 Koga M et al., Description of pain associated with persistent postoperative pain after total knee arthroplasty, Sci Rep 2024;14(1):15217.
- 30 Lo LWT et al., Early Postoperative Pain After Total Knee Arthroplasty Is Associated with Subsequent Poorer Functional Outcomes and Lower Satisfaction, J Arthroplasty 2021 ;36(7):2466-2472.
- 31 Lakra A et al., Early Postoperative Pain Predicts 2-Year Functional Outcomes following Knee Arthroplasty, J Knee Surg 2020;33(11):1132-1139.
- 32 Lavand homme PM et al., Pain trajectories identify patients at risk of persistent pain after knee arthroplasty: an observational study, Clin Orthop Relat Res 2014;472(5):1409-15.
- 33 Wylde V et al, Variability in long-term pain and function trajectories after total knee replacement: A cohort study Orthop Traumatol Surg Res 2019;105(7):1345-1350.
- 34 Repky S et al., Five years' trajectories of functionality and pain in patients after hip or knee replacement and association with long-term patient survival, Sci Rep. 2020; 10: 1438.

© LINK 999_WP_002_2024_LinkSymphoKnee_en

Waldemar Link GmbH & Co. KG

Barkhausenweg 10 · 22339 Hamburg, Germany Phone +49 40 53995-0 · info@link-ortho.com www.link-ortho.com

