



Device Survivorship in Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: American Joint Replacement Registry vs. International Data

Presenter: James I. Huddleston, MD

Co-authors: Bryan D. Springer, MD, Kyle Mullen MPH, Patrick Donnelly MA, Edward Caton, Mr. Keith Tucker



Orthopaedic Data Evaluation Panel



Disclosures

AAOS: Board or committee member AJRR: Board or committee member AAHKS: Board or committee member Apple: Research support Biomet: Paid consultant; Research support Corin U.S.A.: Paid consultant; Research support DePuy: IP royalties; Paid consultant Exactech: IP royalties; Paid consultant Hip Society: Board or committee member Journal of Arthroplasty: Editorial board Knee Society: Board or committee member; Research support Porosteon: Stock options Wolters Kluwer Health - Lippincott Williams & Wilkins: Publishing royalties Yale CORE/CMS: Paid consultant Zimmer: Paid consultant; Research support







Introduction

AAOS encompasses five active registries with over **1,500 submitting institutions** and 12,700 registered surgeons across all 50 states



To date, the AJRR represents **over 3.4 million procedures** and over 10 years of data collection







Introduction: Is AJRR Data Representative in US?

RESEARCH: RESEARCH ARTICLE

Is American Joint Replacement Registry Data Representative of National Data? A Comparative Analysis

Porter, Kimberly R. PhD, MPH; Illgen, Richard L. MD; Springer, Bryan D. MD; Bozic, Kevin J. MD; Sporer, Scott M. MD; Huddleston, James I. MD; Lewallen, David G. MD; Browne, James A. MD







KNEE TULACCES A IS AMERICAN JOINT REPLACEMENT REGISTRY (AJRR) DATA REPRESENTATIVE OF NATIONAL DATA? A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The Knee Society (TKS) 2020 Members Meeting, held online, 10-12 September 2020.

Richard L. Illgen v Bryan D. Springer v Kevin J. Bozic v Scott M. Sporer v James I. Huddleston v David G. Lewallen v Kimberly Porter v James A. Browne v

Joint Replacement



E. Anthony Rankin, MD

NIS US
 AAOS-AJRR

Orthopedics, 2013;36(3):175-176

Published Online: February 22, 2013 · https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20130222-02 · Cited by: 16



Introduction:

Is AJRR Data Representative Worldwide?

- Implications for international comparisons
 - \circ Benchmarking
 - Regulatory Approval
 - More implants entering US market than anywhere else in the world

• Example: ODEP Ratings

Criteria - A* Ratings 3A* 5A* 7A* 10A* 13A* 15A Minimum number of centres outside development centre 3		riteria - Total Kr	nee Replaceme	ent			
Minimum number of centres outside development centre(s) 3	Criteria - A* Ratings	3A*	5A*	7A*	10A*	13A*	15A*
Minimum number of surgeons outside of the development centre 3	Minimum number of centres outside development centre(s)	3	3	3	3	3	3
Minimum total cohort 150 250 350 500 500 600 65 Minimum total cohort 150 225 300 40 40 <td>Minimum number of surgeons outside of the development centre</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td> <td>3</td>	Minimum number of surgeons outside of the development centre	3	3	3	3	3	3
Minimum at risk at benchmark time 150 225 300 400 600 655 51 6.0% 6.0% 6.5% 50% 6.0% 6.5% 51 43 3	Minimum total cohort	150	250	350	500	500	500
Maximum revision rate ‡ 3.5% 4.0% 4.5% 5.0% 6.0% 6.5 Criteria - A Ratings 3A 5A 7A 10A 13A 15 Minimum mumber of centres and surgeons 3	Minimum at risk at benchmark time	150	225	300	400	400	400
Criteria - A Ratings 3A 5A 7A 10A 13A 15A Minimum number of centres and surgeons 3	Maximum revision rate ‡	3.5%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%	6.0%	6.5%
Minimum number of centres and surgeons 3	Criteria - A Ratings	3A	5A	7A	10A	13A	15A
Minimum total cohort 150 250 350 500 500 500 Minimum total cohort 66 60 55 51 45 44 Maximum revision rate 1 5.5% 6.0% 6.5% 7.0% 8.0% 8.5 Criteria - B Ratings 38 58 7.8 108 138 18 Minimum triat cohort 100	Minimum number of centres and surgeons	3	3	3	3	3	3
Minimum at risk at benchmark time 66 60 55 51 45 44 Maximum revision rate 1 55% 6.0% 6.5% 7.0% 8.0% 8.5% ‡ The upper 95% confidence interval for KM revision rate (1 - Survival) must be lower than the specified level 7.0% 8.0% 8.5% Criteria - B Ratings 38 58 78 100 138 15 Minimum number of centres and surgeons 1 <	Minimum total cohort	150	250	350	500	500	500
Maximum revision rate ‡ 5.5% 6.0% 6.5% 7.0% 8.0% 8.5 ‡ The upper 95% confidence interval for KM revision rate (1 - Survival) must be lower than the specified level 1	Minimum at risk at benchmark time	66	60	55	51	45	42
[‡] The upper 95% confidence interval for KM revision rate (1 - Surviva) must be lower than the specified revel Criteria - B Ratings 3B 5B 7B 10B 13B 15 Minimum number of centres and surgeons 1 1 <	Maximum revision rate ‡	5.5%	6.0%	6.5%	7.0%	8.0%	8.5%
Criteria - B Ratings 3B 5B 7B 10B 13B 15F Minimum number of centres and surgeons 1	‡ The upper 95% confidence in	terval for KM revision ra	te (1 - Survival) mus	t be lower than the	specified level		
Minimum number of centres and surgeons 1	Criteria - B Ratings	3B	5B	7B	10B	13B	15B
Minimum total cohort 100 400 40	Minimum number of centres and surgeons	1	1	1	1	1	1
Minimum at risk at benchmark time 40 40 40 40 40 40 40 Maximum value of 95% lower confidence limit for revision rate 3.5% 4.0% 4.5% 5.0% 6.0% 6.5 Pre-Entry A* Pres-Entry Pres-Entry Pres-Entry Pres-Entry Product launched under Beyond Compliance Product details supplied to ODEP Pres-Entry Pres-Entry Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum rol 100 implants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for	Minimum total cohort	100	100	100	100	100	100
Maximum value of 95% lower confidence limit for revision rate 3.5% 4.0% 4.5% 5.0% 6.0% 6.5 Pre-Entry A* Pre-Entry Product launched under Beyond Compliance Product details supplied to ODEP Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum in d10 in plants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for	Minimum at risk at benchmark time	40	40	40	40	40	40
Pre-Entry A* Pre-Entry Product launched under Beyond Compliance Product details supplied to ODEP Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum in f100 implants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for	Maximum value of 95% lower confidence limit for revision rate	3.5%	4.0%	4.5%	5.0%	6.0%	6.5%
Product launched under Beyond Compliance Product details supplied to ODEP Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum i f 100 implants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for	Pre-Entry A*			Pre-	Entry		
Combining data sets: Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum in 100 implants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for		Des dust datalla					
Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 constructs is included in a submission (e.g. for constructs with or without patellae), a minimum i of 100 implants must be available for each construct. In addition, at least one construct must have the minimum volume past the benchmark being applied for	Product launched under Beyond Compliance	Product details	supplied to ODEP				
	Combining data sets: Please note, that where any combination of volumes across 2 c of 100 implants must be available for each construct. In additio	onstructs is included n, at least one cons	d in a submission truct must have th	(e.g. for constru ne minimum volu	ucts with or with me past the ber	out patellae), a m ichmark being ap	ninimum nur oplied for.





- In collaboration with the Orthopaedic Data Evaluation Panel (ODEP), the American Joint Replacement Registry (AJRR) investigated the consistency of both hip and knee arthroplasty survivorship compared to the National Joint Registry of England and Wales (NJR)
- First AJRR device-specific comparison of survivorship against an international registry
- Determine the feasibility of using AJRR data for ODEP Ratings



Methods - Hip

• Three primary hip devices varying in performance and design were selected

- \circ Cementless socket
- \odot Fit and fill cementless stem
- \circ Blade cementless stem
- High-volume implant manufacturers independently submitted Kaplan Meier survivorship to ODEP using NJR data
 - AJRR mirrored methods in independent analysis
- Results were stratified by three age cohorts (all-age,<65, ≥65 years) to facilitate supplementation of AJRR with Medicare claims for all-age and ≥65 age analyses



Methods - Knee

- Three primary knee devices varying in performance and design were selected
 - Posterior stabilized (PS)
 - \odot Cruciate retaining (CR)
 - Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (UKA)
- High-volume implant manufacturers independently submitted Kaplan Meier survivorship to ODEP using NJR data

• AJRR mirrored methods in independent analysis

Results were stratified by three age cohorts (all-age,<65, ≥65 years) to facilitate supplementation of AJRR with Medicare claims for all-age and ≥65 age analyses



Results-Hip

- 210,506 AJRR and 422,657 NJR primary hip cases
- + 65 AJRR 52% and NJR 58%
- Statistical agreement is indicated by overlapping 95% confidence intervals <u>for each</u> survivorship probability between data sources

All-Age Cohort	Years	N	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	8 Years
Socket	US AJRR	101,185	99.08 (99.02, 99.13)	98.67 (98.59, 98.74)	98.42 (98.33, 98.5)	98.17 (98.07, 98.27)	98.07 (97.95, 98.19)
	UK NJR	198,449	99.26 (99.22, 99.30)	98.70 (98.65, 98.75)	98.30 (98.24, 98.36)	97.90 (97.83, 97.97)	97.66 (97.58, 97.74)
Fit and Fill Stem	US AJRR	69,077	99.12 (99.05, 99.19)	98.70 (98.61, 98.79)	98.47 (98.37, 98.57)	98.28 (98.16, 98.39)	98.22 (98.08, 98.34)
	UK NJR	207,187	99.25 (99.21, 99.28)	98.66 (98.61, 98.71)	98.22 (98.16, 98.28)	97.77 (97.70, 97.84)	97.53 (97.45, 97.61)
Blade Stem	US AJRR	40,244	98.28 (98.14, 98.4)	97.56 (97.4, 97.71)	97.10 (96.92, 97.27)	96.79 (96.59, 96.98)	96.67 (96.44, 96.88)
	UK NJR	17,021	98.82 (98.65, 98.97)	98.18 (97.96, 98.37)	97.79 (97.55, 98.01)	97.47 (97.19, 97.71)	97.28 (96.99, 97.55)
Age 65+ Cohort	Years	N	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	8 Years
Socket	US AJRR	52,727	98.99 (98.9, 99.07)	98.55 (98.44, 98.65)	98.33 (98.2, 98.44)	98.05 (97.9, 98.19)	97.98 (97.8, 98.13)
	UK NJR	115,212	99.25 (99.20, 99.30)	98.82 (98.76, 98.88)	98.53 (98.46, 98.60)	98.24 (98.15, 98.32)	98.05 (97.95, 98.14)
Fit and Fill Stem	US AJRR	36,207	99.09 (98.98, 99.18)	98.70 (98.58, 98.82)	98.51 (98.38, 98.64)	98.31 (98.15, 98.46)	98.22 (98.03, 98.4)
	UK NJR	120,754	99.23 (99.18, 99.28)	98.78 (98.72, 98.84)	98.46 (98.38, 98.53)	98.09 (98.00, 98.17)	97.88 (97.78, 97.97)
Blade Stem	US AJRR	20,422	97.98 (97.78, 98.17)	97.18 (96.93, 97.4)	96.60 (96.32, 96.86)	96.20 (95.88, 96.49)	95.99 (95.62, 96.33)
	UK NJR	7,936	98.67 (98.39, 98.90)	98.06 (97.73, 98.35)	97.69 (97.32, 98.01)	97.40 (96.99, 97.76)	97.17 (96.71, 97.56)
Age <65 Cohort	Years	N	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	8 Years
Socket	US AJRR	44,891	99.19 (99.1, 99.27)	98.81 (98.7, 98.91)	98.52 (98.4, 98.64)	98.30 (98.15 <i>,</i> 98.44)	98.18 (98, 98.34)
	UK NJR	83,237	99.27 (99.21, 99.33)	98.55 (98.46, 98.62)	97.99 (97.89, 98.09)	97.47 (97.35, 97.58)	97.18 (97.05, 97.31)
Fit and Fill Stem	US AJRR	30,352	99.18 (99.07, 99.28)	98.70 (98.56, 98.82)	98.42 (98.26, 98.56)	98.23 (98.05 <i>,</i> 98.39)	98.18 (97.99, 98.36)
	UK NJR	86,433	99.27 (99.21, 99.32)	98.48 (98.40, 98.56)	97.90 (97.80, 98.00)	97.35 (97.24, 97.47)	97.06 (96.93, 97.19)
Blade Stem	US AJRR	18,436	98.58 (98.4, 98.74)	97.94 (97.72, 98.14)	97.59 (97.34, 97.81)	97.35 (97.08, 97.6)	97.29 (97.01, 97.55)
	UK NJR	9,085	98.96 (98.72, 99.15)	98.28 (97.99, 98.53)	97.88 (97.55, 98.17)	97.52 (97.14, 97.85)	97.38 (96.98, 97.73)





Results – Hip

- AJRR and NJR showed similar trends for comparatively high and low performing devices
 - 0.18% average difference in survivorship at eight years (final follow-up)
- Blade stem did not reach statistical agreement for allage and 65+ cohorts but showed only 0.61% difference in survivorship at eight years
- Socket and fit and fill stem reached statistical agreement at four and five years in all-age and through seven and eight years in the ≥65-year-old cohort.









RR America Joint Rep Registry

Results - Knee

- There were 42,671 AJRR and 60,439 NJR primary knee cases
- Statistical agreement is indicated by overlapping 95% confidence intervals for each survivorship probability between data sources

All-Age Cohort	Years	N	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	8 Years
UKA Device	US AJRR	16,525	98.99 (98.83, 99.14)	97.51 (97.24, 97.75)	96.49 (96.15, 96.8)	95.70 (95.28, 96.08)	95.55 (95.11, 95.95)
	UK NJR	6,486	99.17 (98.91, 99.37)	97.59 (97.15, 97.95)	96.32 (95.77, 96.81)	94.78 (94.04, 95.42)	94.11 (93.29, 94.84)
PS TKA Device	US AJRR	20,010	99.33 (99.2, 99.43)	98.65 (98.47, 98.8)	98.26 (98.05, 98.45)	98.04 (97.79, 98.27)	97.80 (97.46, 98.09)
	UK NJR	18,022	99.45 (99.32, 99.55)	98.61 (98.41, 98.78)	97.93 (97.68, 98.15)	97.62 (97.34, 97.87)	97.38 (97.07 <i>,</i> 97.66)
CR TKA Device	US AJRR	6,136	99.44 (99.21, 99.6)	98.60 (98.25, 98.89)	98.15 (97.73, 98.49)	98.04 (97.6, 98.4)	97.84 (97.33, 98.25)
	UK NJR	35,931	99.58 (99.51, 99.64)	98.84 (98.71, 98.96)	98.41 (98.25, 98.55)	98.09 (97.90, 98.25)	97.90 (97.70, 98.09)
Ago SEE Cobort	Voars	N	1 Voor	2 Voors	E Voars	7 Voors	9 Voors
UKA Device		7 718			07 /1 (06 08 07 70)	96 70 (96 14, 97 18)	0 Tears
		2 2 1 9	99.19 (98.90, 99.37)	98.07 (97.72, 98.37)	97.41 (90.96, 97.79)	90.70 (90.14, 97.18)	96.70 (96.14, 97.18)
		5,510	99.10 (98.78, 99.42)	97.89 (97.30, 98.35)	97.01 (96.28, 97.59)	95.91 (94.97, 96.68)	95.26 (94.15, 96.16)
PS TKA Device	US AJRR	12,950	99.39 (99.24, 99.51)	98.82 (98.61, 99)	98.59 (98.35, 98.8)	98.46 (98.18, 98.69)	98.16 (97.76, 98.49)
	UK NJR	12,687	99.43 (99.28, 99.55)	98.89 (98.68, 99.07)	98.37 (98.10, 98.60)	98.14 (97.83, 98.40)	97.96 (97.63, 98.25)
CR TKA Device	US AJRR	4,019	99.49 (99.21, 99.67)	99.06 (98.7, 99.33)	98.68 (98.23, 99.01)	98.63 (98.17, 98.97)	98.63 (98.17, 98.97)
	UK NJR	25,342	99.60 (99.52, 99.68)	99.02 (98.88, 99.14)	98.69 (98.52, 98.85)	98.45 (98.25, 98.62)	98.26 (98.03, 98.46)
Age <65 Cohort	Years	N	1 Year	3 Years	5 Years	7 Years	8 Years
UKA Device	US AJRR	8,072	98.80 (98.54, 99.02)	96.97 (96.54, 97.34)	95.61 (95.06, 96.1)	94.78 (94.12, 95.36)	94.48 (93.78, 95.11)
	UK NJR	3,168	99.18 (98.79, 99.45)	97.27 (96.60, 97.82)	95.63 (94.75, 96.37)	93.65 (92.47, 94.64)	92.98 (91.70, 94.07)
PS TKA Device	US AJRR	6,284	99.17 (98.91, 99.37)	98.18 (97.8, 98.5)	97.49 (97.02, 97.9)	97.07 (96.47, 97.58)	96.91 (96.2, 97.49)
	UK NJR	5,335	99.47 (99.23, 99.64)	97.95 (97.49, 98.32)	96.93 (96.36, 97.41)	96.47 (95.84, 97.01)	96.11 (95.43, 96.69)
CR TKA Device	US AJRR	1,640	99.16 (98.56, 99.51)	97.23 (96.22, 97.97)	96.57 (95.43, 97.42)	96.31 (95.1, 97.22)	95.54 (93.97, 96.71)
	UK NJR	10,589	99.53 (99.37, 99.64)	98.42 (98.14, 98.66)	97.75 (97.40, 98.05)	97.28 (96.87, 97.63)	97.11 (96.68, 97.48)





Results - Knee

- Similar trends for comparatively high and low performing devices through final follow-up (eight years)
- All three devices showed clinical and statistical agreement in survivorship for all cohorts in early and mid-term followup
- UKA device was statistically agreeable up to 7 years in all age cohort but fell outside this range at 8 years









Conclusion

- AJRR performance hip and knee arthroplasty trends and survivorship were similar to NJR's hip and knee arthroplasty trends and survivorship
- All cohorts were similar with greatest consistency in the age ≥65 cohort
- Encouraging results for reliability of outcome capture in AJRR compared to the highest capture total joint arthroplasty registry in the world
- Implications for global improvement in patient safety
- ODEP Pilot Underway







Registry Program *Improving Orthopaedic Care Through Data*

Improving orthopaedic care through data.

Thank you!