

International Success and Failure of the Treatment of Periprosthetic Hip Infection: A Preliminary Report

Jesus M Villa, Jesse E Otero, Thomas K Fehring, Alex Soriano, Simon W Young, Yale Fillingham, Cade Shadbolt, Craig Aboltins, Jonathan Darby, Yves S Poy Lorenzo, Michelle Maree Dowsey, Sina Babazadeh, Nicolas Santiago Piuizzi, Carlos A Higuera Rueda

INTRODUCTION: Multiple studies have evaluated the success of different surgical modalities for periprosthetic joint infection (PJI), but most reports are limited to data from single centers/countries. Thus, this preliminary report from the Orthopaedic Device Infection Network (ODIN), which is a collaboration of seven organizations across Australia, New Zealand, the Netherlands, Spain and the United States using standardized data collection/centralized analysis, attempts to overcome that barrier and find an answer to the following questions: What is (1) the success rate of hip PJI treatment, and the postoperative rates of (2) amputation or (3) mortality?

METHODS: Data for this report was collected at 4 institutions. Inclusion criteria was hip arthroplasty treated for PJI (n=242). Study period: 1995 to 2023. Demographics, body mass index (BMI), Charlson Comorbidity Index (CCI), and baseline surgical/infection characteristics such as type of index arthroplasty (primary vs. revision), index arthroplasty indication, infection type (i.e., chronic), infecting organisms, and type of surgery (i.e., single-stage) were noted. Success/failure was assessed according to the Musculoskeletal Infection Society (MSIS) Outcome Reporting Tool (tiers I to III) and a composite outcome (failure: amputation, death, implant revision/removal or infection relapse according to clinician). Postoperative amputations and deaths were also noted. Follow-up range: 6 weeks to 10 years.

RESULTS: Mean age, BMI, and CCI were 65 years, 31.7 Kg/m², and 3.7, respectively. Majority of hips treated for PJI were primaries (n=170), most were early infections (<90 days, n=119), and the most common infecting organism was Staphylococcus aureus (n=84). Surgical/infection characteristics are shown in Table 1A. Postoperatively, 47 and 60% of hips were categorized as success according to MSIS (tiers I/II) and composite outcome tools, respectively. At latest follow-up, no hip underwent amputation, but mortality rate was 19% (n=46) (Table 1B).

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: The reported failure of treatment of PJI after hip arthroplasty is higher than what have usually been reported in single institution series. The heterogeneity of an international cohort may be more representative of the current PJI treatment outcome. A little more than half of the cases were successfully managed regardless of the success/failure outcome reporting tool utilized. These humbling results call for improvement of strategies to treat hip PJI.

Table 1A. Baseline surgical and infection characteristics.

Surgical and Infection Variables	Entire Cohort (N=242)	
Type of index arthroplasty (spatial record for infection), N (%)	Primary	170 (70)
	Revision	72 (30)
	Unknown	40 (17)
	Dislocation	95 (39)
	Acetabular Necrosis	10 (4)
	Fluorinated Adhesin	3 (1)
Indication for index arthroplasty (deduction for the repair that was required for infection), N (%)	Mitigance	10 (4)
	Fracture	10 (4)
	Non-Acute Infection	1 (0)
	PJI	22 (9)
	Other	22 (9)
	Early (<3 months after arthroplasty)	119 (49)
Type of Infection, N (%)	Chronic (>3 months after arthroplasty)	94 (39)
	Low-severity (therapeutic)	22 (9)
	Unknown	4 (2)
	Missing Data	3 (1)
Culture Results, N (%)	Negative	20 (8)
	Single-organism	114 (47)
Infecting Organisms (de-identified codes), N (%)	Polymicrobial	98 (40)
	Staphylococcus aureus	84
	Staphylococcus epidermidis	44
	Clostridium acetii	10
	Staphylococcus capitis sp. novus	16
	Enterococcus faecalis	15
Staphylococcus haemolyticus	15	

Table 1B. Treatment results of periprosthetic hip infection.

Surgery Type, N (%)	Staphylococcus spp. (comprised majority)	
		Staphylococcus spp. (comprised majority)
PJI: Periprosthetic joint infection; DAIR: Debridement antibiotics implant retention; Sp: Species.	<i>Escherichia coli</i>	13
	Other	122
	No Surgery	5 (2)
	DAIR	124 (51)
	Arthroscopic Debridement	1 (0)
	Single-stage Exchange Arthroplasty	16 (7)
	Explanation WITH spacer implantation with the aim of 2-stage exchange	41 (17)
	Explanation WITHOUT spacer implantation with the aim of 2-stage exchange	8 (3)
	Girdlestone	3 (1)
	Missing Data	4 (2)

Results	Entire Cohort (N=242)	
Success or Failure According to MSIS Outcome Reporting Tool (Tiers I/II [Success] vs. Tier III [Failure]), N (%)	Tier I or II	114 (47)
	Tier III	51 (21)
	Missing Data	77 (32)
Amputation, N (%)	No	235 (97)
	Yes	0 (0)
	Missing Data	7 (3)
Death, N (%)	No	191 (79)
	Yes	46 (19)
	Missing Data	5 (2)
Success of Failure According to Composite Outcome (Failure: amputation, death, implant revision/removal or relapse of infection as determined by the treating clinician) N (%)	Success	145 (60%)
	Failure	92 (38%)
	Missing	5 (2)

MSIS: Musculoskeletal Infection Society.