MIDWEST ORTHOPAEDICS at RUSH

### PROXIMAL FEMORAL REPLACEMENT FOR THE TREATMENT OF ONCOLOGIC DISORDERS IN THE HIP

C Gusho BS<sup>1</sup>, B Clayton MD<sup>1</sup>, N Mehta MD<sup>1</sup>, P Escobedo BS<sup>1</sup>, M Colman MD<sup>1</sup>, S Gitelis MD<sup>1</sup>, A Blank, MD, MS<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>RUSH UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

Disclosures: Please see AAOS/MSTS list of disclosures.

## INTRODUCTION

Proximal femoral bone tumors are often treated with proximal femoral replacement (PFR).

Uncertainty remains regarding the rates of survivorship and complications in PFR.<sup>1-4</sup>



The rate of revision was 5.1% (2 cases).
Both were cemented Stryker implants - infected dislocation, periprosthetic fracture.
Median implant survival was 115 months.
10-year survival probability was 93.3%.



OVERALL IMPLANT SURVIVAL



RUSH UNIVERSITY MEDICAL CENTER

RUSH UNIVERSIT

This study evaluated a single institutional experience with PFR and analyzed complications and implant survival over a 15-year period.

# <u>METHODS</u>

Thirty-eight procedures (37 patients) were identified and retrospectively reviewed from years 2005-2019.

	Frequency	Percent
Chondrosarcoma	8	21.1





#### MONTHS

Figure 2. Proximal femoral implant survivorship (n=38).

Ewing sarcoma	I	2.6
Lymphoma	I	2.6
Metastatic bone disease	20	52.6
Myxofibrosarcoma	I	2.6
Osteosarcoma	4	10.5
Pathological fracture	2	5.3
Soft tissue sarcoma		2.6
Total	38	100.0

#### Table I. Preoperative diagnoses.

	Frequency*	Percent
Guardian®/ELEOS™	14	35.8
Stryker GMRS	10	25.6
LINK®	9	23.I
Zimmer Segmental	3	77

## <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>

For oncologic disorders of the proximal femur, modular endoprosthetic replacement is safe and reliable.

We believe our low revision rates are due to combination of improved surgical technique over time as well as postoperative use of a brace.



#### Table 11. Surgery characteristics. \*missing data omitted.

Figure I. Following proximal femoral removal (A), an endoprosthesis was implanted: LINK®
(B), custom Stanmore (C), Styrker GMRS (D),
Zimmer compress (E), Guardian®/ELEOS™(F).

### <u>REFERENCES</u>

I.Ahlmann ER, Menendez LR, Kermani C, Gotha H. Survivorship and clinical outcome of modular endoprosthetic reconstruction for neoplastic disease of the lower limb. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2006;88(6):790-795. doi:<u>10.1302/0301-620X.88B6.17519</u>
2. Bernthal NM, Greenberg M, Heberer K, Eckardt JJ, Fowler EG. What are the functional outcomes of endoprosthestic reconstructions after tumor resection? *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2015;473(3):812-819. doi:<u>10.1007/s11999-014-3655-1</u>
3. Cannon CP, Mirza AN, Lin PP, Lewis VO, Yasko AW. Proximal Femoral Endoprosthesis for the Treatment of Metastatic. *ORTHOPEDICS.* 2008;31(4):361-361. doi:<u>10.3928/01477447-20080401-03</u>
4. Chandrasekar CR, Grimer RJ, Carter SR, Tillman RM, Abudu AT. Modular endoprosthetic replacement for metastatic tumours of the proximal femur. *J Orthop Surg Res.* 2008;3:50. doi:<u>10.1186/1749-799X-3-50</u>