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Abstract:

Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA) has become a well-established treatment modality for surgical correction of knee disorders and pain generated by arthritis and other disorders such as trauma. Today a patient can expect to rely on his new knee to serve him with comfort for a fair number of years if not his entire life. TKA has taken on a predicated level of confidence and certain trends have developed over the years. Success has increased demand and the health care system is challenged to meet current and growing demand for surgery [In fact, the epidemiological studies have predicted that hips will grow only a little whereas knees are projected to have a 6-fold increase - see Kutz AAOS Scientific Exhibit 2006].

Surgical techniques are specializing into specific indications or camps for specialized product features. Uni-compartmental, Bi-compartmental, Total Knee with and without replacement of the patella, along with Patella-femoral replacement are some of the product classifications now available. The near future is now with articular focal defect replacement. New materials and techniques will open this area to increased indications as the sport-medicine surgeon finds his way into this growing surgical market.

Introduction:

This review is being drafted as a quick narrative summary and is not meant to be a comprehensive review on the subject. The combined experience of the two authors totals over eighty years in the field of total joint surgery and we feel reasonably confident in our expressed opinions.

Primarily, all surgery is dependent on surgical technique. Technique is more important than material and design. Poor technique places an increased burden on design and materials, and improved materials and designs can ease the burden on surgical technique but never replace the overall benefit of good technique.

The clinical assessments (in-vivo; ex-vivo) for wear ranged 50-400 mm³/year for either ‘backside’ wear or ‘overall’ knee wear (RSA and retrievals). These values were at least as high if not higher than for total hip replacements. Note that there is no data for ‘frontside’ knee wear by itself. Clearly there is little known from such ‘dimensional’ studies of how much change was due to creep or plastic flow as distinct from wear.
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Wear estimates, for laboratory knee studies, fell in the narrow range of 3-10 mm/year. Clearly these were at least an order of magnitude less than that reported from clinical studies. Interestingly, there has been no insight given as to why such a discrepancy exits in the wear testing literature. However, since these are generally gravimetric wear assessments we believe that they do represent true wear. Whether it is physiologically correct is another question.

We excluded two simulator wear rates from discussion. One by an Italian group produced a wear rate of 24mm³/Mc with no explanation. One by an American group added hyaluronic acid to the lubricant and obtained wear rates of 64mm³/Mc. While they may have been on to something the observed changes were so profound and not yet confirmed by any other study such that some caution is justified here.

Introduction to Complexity in Knee Wear Assessment

Knee development over the past decade has included improvements in implant designs and use of polyethylene bearings with superior wear resistance. The latter is one of the major factors involved in knee wear performance, i.e. the choice of polyethylene resin, the method of forming the bearing, method of sterilization, any post-sterilization heat treatments and the shelf aging of the polyethylene before implantation. Obvious improvements have been made in the polyethylene as a result of sterilization with irradiation in an inert environment or with non-irradiation sterilization methods. However, controversy remains over whether it is better to highly-crosslink polyethylene bearings to obtain maximum wear resistance or whether it is preferable to use non-crosslinked polyethylene to maintain better mechanical properties such as tensile strength and fatigue resistance. Some companies sterilize with EtO and Gas Plasma (GP) while others cross-link up to 7.5Mrad (Zimmer).

Clinical wear assessments can be either from radiographic studies (RSA) of ongoing patients or from selected retrievals. Both represent very difficult tasks and the more exacting the method the fewer number of patients or follow-up duration. Unfortunately, obtaining an understanding of wear performance in patient’s knee joints can be a daunting task. There are large dissimilarities in implants design, surgical effectiveness, patient populations, variations in follow-up periods, different observers that can reflect observer bias; novel methods of wear assessment and unique definitions for osteolysis. Many retrieval studies have characterized the degree of ‘damage’ apparent on the surfaces of retrieved polyethylene bearings. However, it is readily apparent that such “damage” on polyethylene bearings could be due primarily to plastic deformation and not to removal of polyethylene per se, i.e. no actual ‘wear’. Thus, characterizing the ‘damage severity’ may be totally irrelevant to the wear process in vivo. So thus far, very few studies have actually quantified volumetric wear in-vivo. Therefore, much of our knowledge on knee wear performance has to come from laboratory simulations.

Simulating knee wear in a laboratory test requires knowledge of the many factors that influence joint loading, position, motion and lubrication. The degree of bearing conformity will greatly affect the contact areas, the resulting contact stresses throughout the range of motion, and the knee stability. Also variation in contact loads during various activities such as normal walking, climbing stairs and rising from a seated position, will greatly affect the wear potential. There are alternative knee designs that incorporate mobile polyethylene bearings that articulate with both CoCr femoral and CoCr tibial surfaces. The latter design aims to lower contact stresses in the polyethylene spacer by making it more conforming to the femoral articular surface. It also provides a flat tibial surface, which reduces the anteroposterior constraints. However, this design strategy also has the potential for wear on two bearing surfaces instead of one. There is some concern that fretting type of ‘backside’ wear between the polyethylene and its locking tibial tray may a potential source of wear debris. Some studies have indicated that this ‘backside’ wear may be a large portion of the total polyethylene wear. However,
polishing of the proximal surface of the tibial base plate in contemporary designs may have alleviated such concerns.

Product Review

Uni-Compartmental Knee

Uni-Compartmental Knee Design is limited to one tibio-femoral compartment. There has been and continues to be significant debate over the indications and over all success of this type of surgical treatment vs. conventional total knee. In addition, there are different styles of Uni-Compartmental knee designs.

Experience over the years shows the various risks needed for further operations for degeneration in other compartments, including retropatellar pain and tibial implant settling with the in-lay all-poly components. The original “Marmor technique” required seating the tibial implant into a trough burred into the tibial metaphysis. This technique can lead to irregularities in the orientation of the implant and may in itself have been a prime cause of early loosening.

Examples of Uni-Compartmental Designs

Proper implant surgical technique is as critical as proper indication for Uni-knees. The tibial implant must be seated at right angles to the anatomical axis of the tibia. As with other knee surgery “eyeball approximation” has not proved satisfactory. Instrumentation is critical and the trend is even moving towards robotics to ensure correct alignment. Proper implant orientation takes significant loads off the implant material reducing early mechanical failure due to cold flow, deformation and fatigue failure.

Robotics are now being used in the planning process and provides for “virtual” cutting guide eliminating the need for conventional and or custom cutting blocks. Time will tell if this style automation will produce better outcomes. It will come down to a cost benefit ratio.
Total Knee Designs

There is a large spectrum of knee designs and many have come and gone. They can be summarized as the following:

Linked implants
- Hinged: those that allow flexion and extension but not axial rotation
- Rotating: those which allow flexion, extension and also axial rotation

Non-linked implants
- Non-constrained (resurfacing)
- Conforming implants
- Anterior-posterior stabilizing
- Varus-valgus stabilizing

The one element all current knee designs share is part of the bearing surface (tibial implant) is made of polyethylene. There were some early designs that featured the femoral component made of polyethylene (Charnley, St. George-hinged) and as a result they encountered material failure.

Linked implants are those in which the femoral and tibial components are bolted, screwed or otherwise fixed together by mechanical means. These early designs were intended for limited function and were an alternative to arthrodesis. These were available from the early 1950’s -1980s. Rotation was added to hinged knees with the Herbert (1973), Knoles (1973), Spherocentric (1973), Attenborough (1978), Rotating Kinematic (1978). These early designs have not stood the test of time but were valuable in helping us to understand the problems of fixation, wear, and knee biomechanics. At present, linked implants have a small but significant role in TKA. They are indicated mainly in those knees in which the collateral ligaments are markedly deficient.

Unlinked implants are those in which the femoral and tibial components are not joined; the components are free to separate from each other but are prevented from doing so by the soft tissues. The term “unlinked” is not synonymous with “non-constrained”. A non-constrained implant is one in which the tibial surfaces are relatively flat. These implants require normal cruciate and collateral ligaments. There are now different levels of cupped surfaces to offer mild to significant restraint to varus-valgus, anterior-posterior or translatory forces. Most of these conforming implants require sacrifice of the anterior or both the anterior and posterior cruciate ligaments.

Resurfacing implants have of late been restricted to the Uni-compartmental knee designs but are beginning to be developed once-again for total knee arthroplasty, as early intervention is being advocated by younger joint surgeons and sports medicine surgeons. The advent of better instrumentation and/or custom “personalized instruments” is also moving TKA into a new and fast growing market segment. This technology develops cutting guides from MRI providing for an individual patient approach to TKA. The concept holds that better implant alignment will reduce stress on the implants improving survivorship.

The growing demand for TKA is starting to place a significant burden on our health care system and future demand predicted at over 600% growth in the next 15 years can end up resulting in some patients not being treated. This is already forcing surgeons and companies to look back at previous designs and results for all polyethylene tibial components. There
is a growing concept expressed by the American Association of Hip and Knee surgeons that the older patients (less activity, +70 year old) be treated with all-poly tibial components, thereby reducing the financial burden on the health care system.

**Technique “Alignment”**

Alignment is critical to insure joint stability and reduce loads on the implants. Instrumentation properly used will enable proper joint reconstruction and joint stability.

Analog hand held instruments are slowly being obsoleted by newer high tech automated technology.

Example of the IBloCk® automated cutting guide. This is an intelligent instrument allowing intraoperative customization in conventional TKA using real-time virtual planning technology.

Most major and some mid-size companies are working hard to develop smart instruments along with surgical navigation technology. The basic belief is the better the alignment the better the outcome.

**Examples of TKA failures:**

Alignment is critical to insure joint stability and reduce loads on the implants. Instrumentation properly used will enable proper joint reconstruction and joint stability.
Examples of material failures:

As with total hip implants improved bearing surfaces are being developed to reduce the generation of wear particles. Ceram Tec AG has set itself the goal of increasing the life of artificial knee joints using ceramic femoral condyles with polyethylene. The advanced Biolox® delta is being evaluated in a number of ceramic knee designs.

It is important to remember that most total knees fail due to mechanical overload either caused by mal-alignment and/or overload by patient related activities. Joint instability (resulting in increased implant loads on material) is the critical failure path for total knee implants. New materials have resulted in some early failures as demonstrated above and have made the market place question the basic science to an increased level of scrutiny. Testing new materials in a worst case or increased activity level will become the new standard.

Clinicals and Retrievals for Knee Wear Studies

Measuring wear from retrieved components is a difficult proposition. Not only is it difficult to determine the control knee measurements (unworn ‘before’), estimating the change (‘after’) due to wear, as distinct to creep or plastic flow, adds additional uncertainties. For example, it is generally believed that crosslinking effects will greatly reduce wear of the UHMWPE insert. Thus, it is puzzling to read that one analysis of retrieved tibial inserts apparently demonstrated an 84% reduction in linear wear with EtO sterilized inserts compared to gamma/air (90um/year versus 550um/year). In other words, non-crosslinked knees did better (Williams et al 1998). A secondary limitation is that wear debris is a volume consideration. Studies quoting only “linear” wear data offer little help in this regard.

Collier et al (2005) provided a very interesting study of design features using the AMK knee. They asked...
the question whether polyethylene processing, sterilization method or tray design (backside wear) had made a difference to the prevalence of osteolysis in the AMK design. The roughness of titanium base plate (Ra 1,000nm) that was 10-fold greater than the later CoCr design (< 100 nm).

The study was additionally complicated by the use of 4 types of resin (GUR: 1050, 1900, 4120, 4150) and four sterilization methods (EtO= 4, gamma/air = 263, gamma/N2 = 54 and gas plasma = 44). Shelf age was another factor with the inserts averaging 0.9 years with maximum life at 7.1 years. At 8 years follow-up, the highest osteolysis was a 54% incidence (‘confirmed’ + ‘suspicious’) for the combination Ti64 tray with gamma/air. At 8 years, the least osteolysis was 21% for the combination with CoCr tray and gamma/N2, i.e. reduced by more than half! At lesser time of 6 years, osteolysis was 28% for combination CoCr/GP-sterilized. Thus four conclusions were considered:

a) Osteolysis was 4-fold more likely with AMK gamma/air than gamma/N2.
b) Osteolysis with Ti64 trays was 2.6-fold more likely than with CoCr base plates.
c) Knee hyperextension (impingement) added more risk of osteolysis.
d) It was noted that the non-crosslinked (GP) AMKs did quite well!!

It was also interesting that the incidence of osteolysis with the AMK design could be as high as 54% at only 8 years.

A detailed AMK retrieval study set out to measure ‘backside’ wear (Conditt et al, 2005). A set of 15 retrieved AMK tibial inserts were analyzed with 3-12 years use. Each retrieved insert was scanned for backside wear by a laser profilometer. The backside wear averaged 138 mm³/year (SD± 95 mm³/yr). With maximum wear being approximately 3-fold greater than the average, this meant that some cases had wear approaching 420 mm³/year. This is a very large wear rate, particularly for only backside wear of the AMK design. Noted here but not reviewed, a second paper reported backside wear in fixed-bearing TKR as 120 mm³/yr (Mayor et al, AAOS 2005).

For a different approach, Oxford UK attempted RSA measurements of knee wear from x-rays. This would appear at first glance to be an impossible task. Gill et al (2006) used RSA method in 6 well functioning AGC cases (6 years follow-up). They estimated total volume loss could be from 400 mm³ to 1,056 mm³. Their best average was given as 600 mm³, representing a wear rate of 100 mm³/year. Thus, this overall RSA wear rate for AGC cases was in the same range as the backside wear of the AMK knees. They also provided an estimate of contact areas in-vivo using knee models and penetration depths through flexion (Fig. 1).

A retrieval study of the Low Contact Stress Knee (LCS; DePuy, Warsaw) suggested that wear of the rotation surfaces wear of the rotational surfaces (backside) could be a large portion of the polyethylene wear (Atwood 2008). They examined damage and wear in a 100 retrieved LCS-RP mobile bearings with in vivo durations ranging 2-170 months. The inserts were GUR 415 and 1050 machined from ram-extruded bar and sterilized by gamma/air. The backside wear averaged 3 times greater at 2 years (164 mm³/yr) than for durations >2 years (54 mm³/yr). Once again these wear rates were of the order 100+ mm³/yr.

So overall, the in-vivo knee wear estimates ranged 50-400 mm³/year (Table 1). These are at least as high if not higher than total hip replacements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knee Wear</th>
<th>Backside</th>
<th>Frontside</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Upper Limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditt 2005</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor 2005</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gill 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atwood 2008</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of knee wear rates measured either from RSA clinical studies or from retrievals. Note that estimates of ‘frontside’ wear by itself are not available.
Laboratory Knee Simulations

Knee simulators allow for more control of various experimental parameters to better examine effects of design and material choices. The limitation is that they may not capture the essential environmental aspects and kinematics that produce wear in the patient. There are two concepts prevailing in design of knee simulation machines. The majority of knee wear studies have been run under displacement control, such that the degree of joint flexion, internal and external rotation and antero-posterior motion are dictated by the servo-hydraulic controller using selected motion profiles as its input. The advantage of this method is that it provides consistent tracking, displacements, velocities and phasing relative to femoral flexion and resultant load. The disadvantage is that these may not represent the motion in the patient or be inappropriate for that knee design.

An alternative strategy in knee simulation machines has been to use load-control as a feedback loop, such that the motions of the knee are dictated by the profile of the femoral-tibial bearing surfaces as it reacts to the various force and torque inputs. It is believed that the advantage of this method is that the bearing surfaces are free to track in a more physiological manner. The disadvantage is that the implant tracking and distances traveled may not be predictable for the duration of the wear test.

Given the level of computer control, there are many scenarios that can be used to input knee motions and loadings. This complexity can have a confounding effect when attempting to correlate data between different studies. Kinematic inputs for knee simulators are usually limited to level gait. This raises the question of whether incorporation of activities of daily living (stair ascent, descent, kneeling, rising from chair) would be more severe than for just normal walking tests? In this regard, the frequently quoted International Standards (ISO 14242-1-3, ISO 14243-1) have become quite useful.

It is interesting to ask whether wear rates for walking plus stair climbing would be more severe than for just normal walking tests? In such a study, Cottrell et al (2009) compared NexGen CR Augmentable (CR) to 5 NexGen Legacy PS (LPS: Zimmer, Warsaw). All specimens were 25kGy gamma/ N2 tibial inserts. Three wear tests were conducted: one using standard gait (ISO 14243–1) and two using a combination of gait plus stairs. The authors concluded that wear rates were higher in standard gait compared to gait with added bouts of stair climbing (Table 2). Thus normal walking appeared to be the best estimate for a ‘worst case’ scenario.

Desjardin et al, (2006) speculated that adding hyaluronic acid to bovine serum would make a more realistic lubricant. Using 4 Zimmer knees, they obtained average wear rates of the order for 9.4mm3/ Mc for standard serum in normal gait (21mg/ml albumin protein). These may have been reasonable wear rates (type of UHMWPE not stated) but with HA-serum the wear rates increased to 64mm3/Mc3. The authors may have viewed this as a ‘worst case’ wear scenario but that does not seem a reasonable hypothesis.

Affatato et al, (2008a, b) offered wear rates averaging 3 and 24mm3/year. There was no explanation for the later having such high wear rates (Table 2). So with those 2 exclusions, the overall knee simulator wear estimates fell in the narrow range 3-10 mm3/year (Table 2). Clearly these were at least an order of magnitude less than that reported from clinical studies (Table 1). There has been little insight given as to why such a discrepancy exits.
Grupp et al (2009) provided some interesting contact areas and imaging of worn morphology (Fig. 2). For direct comparison between fixed and mobile bearing knees of same design. They also compared frontside and backside contact areas. Delamination in Total Knee Replacements

Delamination is a form of wear damage in which a thin layer in the surface separates from the deeper layers. This is the severest form of damage to be encountered in total knee replacements. It appears predominantly in inserts processed by gamma sterilized/air in which free radical damage has oxidized the Poly (Bell et al, 1997). Pin-on disc wear tests showed that progressively aged Poly had increased wear until delamination damage finally resulted.

Some early studies noted delamination in only 4% of retrieved Total Condylar inserts by 5 years (Hood et al 1983). Bloebaum et al (1991) noted that generally only about 2% of tibial inserts showed delamination.

However, in a study of 33 PCA inserts, the same group noted that 53% PCA’s showed severe delamination within 4 years of use. They noted a zone 250um to 580 um distance below the surface of these heat-pressed Poly inserts.

Two similar PCA cases were reviewed by Tulp (1992) one with 7mm thick Poly and one with 9mm thickness. Both presented at 3 years with loss of polyethylene thickness on the medial side, evident bone loss with synovitis and pain. Sections showed a well-formed 300um thick surface layer with an underlying poorly formed surface of some 600um thickness.

Klug’s et al (1992) reported on one case with bilateral PCA knees. At 5 years both the 3.5mm thick medial and lateral plateaus had worn through due to a large flaking type of delamination. Debris ranged from micron to millimeters in size and there was massive osteolysis present.

Gillis et al (1999) studied the IB1, IBII, PFC and AMK knee designs. They noted that only the PFC and AMK showed some evidence of delamination.

Akisu et al (2001) reported on a 7 year result with an AMK knee revised for cystic changes and pain. The 10mm thick Poly insert retrieval (sterilized in air) showed deformation and delamination wear and tissues showed many Poly debris and osteolysis. Delamination was present in central medial and lateral aspects and labeled as “severe delamination”. Backside wear was labeled as “mild abrasion”.

A Look Back to the Future “Implant Subsidence in All Polyethylene Tibial Component Cement Mantles”
Charnely’s application of PMMA to artificial joint fixation in 1959 was a milestone achievement in the development of joint replacement surgery. 50 years later, despite its recognized shortcomings PMMA remains the material of choice.

- High stresses and discontinuities in the cement mantle promote crack initiation and propagation.
- Mixing and chilling monomer in PMMA preparation has shown to reduce porosity.

We can address some of these factors by designs being adapted into improved tibial components.

Design comparison between current design and new novel concept design to reduce stress concentrations in the cement mantle.

If we anticipate going back into a greater usage rate of all poly tibial components we need to anticipate that today’s life styles will place more stress on total knee implants. With this in mind a new novel concept was developed to reduce stress concentration at the implant / cement / bone interface. In addition, taking into consideration the trend on tissue sparing approaches a smaller profile was also adapted.

Certain proven features remain although modified to meet design goals.
Cement has no adhesive properties; it is a filler and functions best under compression loads.

**Design Consideration for Cement Mantle**

Current design

Channels for cement in traditional AP tibia.

New Novel Design “Less Stress”

Domed cement / implant interface, no channels

---

**Stress Analysis of cement mantle - ISO14243-1**

41% of gait cycle produces highest loads:
- Axial force = 2281N,
- AP force 108N, - Torque = 5.1Nm

**Results**

20% reduction in stresses in cement mantle for identical component sizing and boundary conditions.
Positions of Features

Insert Deflections

PMMA Mantle Deflections

Decreasing bone stiffness

Decreasing bone stiffness
Observations

- Engineering perspective all poly tibial components can carry in-vivo loads.
- Unique design features do reduce cement mantle stresses.
- Resulting component is engineered to perform better than current all poly component.

However, outcome is significantly effected by:

- Surgical technique “Alignment”
- Cementing technique
- Patient selection (bone quality / activity level)

Summary on new novel design:

- Lower stress in cement mantle compared to current design
- No stress concentrations in cement mantle due to geometry
- Reduced deflections in both insert and cement mantel due to geometry
- Curved insert post for MIS placement of insert.

Overview

It is known from the work of Bartell et al (1986) that there are significant sub-surface shear stresses up to 1mm deep in tibial inserts. Thus the interaction of such peak shear stresses with an adulterated sub-surface delamination zone appeared to result in catastrophic delamination wear in certain knee designs. The most commonly reported appears to be the heat-pressed PCA knees. However, other designs with gamma/air sterilized Poly inserts were also implicated at less than 10 years of use, e.g. AMK and PFC types.

Summary

The wear in gamma-irradiated-in-air polyethylene bearings from unicondylar and total knee replacements is influenced by the shelf age of the polyethylene, the age of the patient (activity) and the postoperative angulation of the reconstruction. Although polyethylene bearing material has not been gamma radiated in air for the past 8-10 years, wear debris is still a significant factor to the survivorship of TKA.

Surgical technique, patient related activity and articulation constraint still place high demands on design of knee systems and material properties. The growing demand for TKA will continue to place increased burdens on the health care system to deliver simple, reproducible and cost affordable knee implants. Improvements in design, materials and surgical technique in a ever tightening fiscal market will remain a significant challenge. There however will remain a high demand for improved product in the younger more active private pay health care market.

The Future

There can be no doubt as to the potential for increased surgical intervention in TKA. As a result, we believe in the combination of incremental improvements in technique, design and material.

Increased mechanical testing of implants in a variety of different positions and under varying loads will aid and hopefully reduce surgical and clinical complications.
Current and future developments will focus on early intervention with cartilage replacement in the form of cartilage transplantation and the refinement of artificial cartilage implant replacements.

Cost will continue to be a problem and might slow down the advancement of newer technologies like robotics and navigation.

Modifications to techniques, design and material need to be carefully documented and followed by clinical evaluations. Changes can only be justified if we are prepared to collect, analyze and publish their results.
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<td>62 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Disorders and Administration Site Conditions</td>
<td>20 (2.0%)</td>
<td>26 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyrexia</td>
<td>22 (2.2%)</td>
<td>24 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous System Disorders</td>
<td>39 (3.8%)</td>
<td>31 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>10 (1.0%)</td>
<td>13 (1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric Disorders</td>
<td>27 (2.7%)</td>
<td>31 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>27 (2.7%)</td>
<td>32 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypersensitivity</td>
<td>32 (3.1%)</td>
<td>31 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Pyrexia adverse reaction frequency data is included in order to alert healthcare practitioners that the antigens of OFIRMEV may mask fever.

Other Adverse Reactions Observed During Clinical Studies of OFIRMEV in Adults
The following additional treatment-emergent adverse reactions were reported by adult subjects treated with OFIRMEV in all clinical trials (n=1020) that occurred with an incidence of at least 1% and at a frequency greater than placebo (≥ 0.5%) in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System Organ Class – Preferred Term</th>
<th>OFIRMEV (N=1020)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metabolism and nutrition disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypophosphatemia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemoglobin decrease</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous system disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatric disorders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypersensitivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pediatric Population
A total of 355 pediatric patients (4 neonates, 6 infants, 317 children, and 11 patients) have received OFIRMEV in active-controlled (n=250) and open-label clinical trials (n=105), including 57.9% (n=32) who received 5 or more doses and 43.4% (n=55) who received more than 10 doses. Pediatric patients received dosages of up to 15 mg/kg every 6 hours or 5 mg/kg every 4 hours, or every 6 hours schedule. The maximum exposure was 77.4, 4.6, 6.8, and 7 days in neonates, infants, children, and adolescents, respectively.

The incidence of 256 in patients treated with OFIRMEV were nausea, vomiting, constipation, pruritus, agitation, and diarrhea.

Other Adverse Reactions Observed During Clinical Studies of OFIRMEV in Pediatrics

OFIRMEV (acetaminophen) injection is indicated for:

In adults. Additional safety and pharmacokinetic data have been collected in 355 patients across the fetal, pediatric, and adult age groups. There is one well-documented report of a rash in a broad infant fed that volunteered when the mother stopped acetaminophen use and recurred when she resumed acetaminophen use and should be exercised when OFIRMEV is administered to a nursing woman.

Pediatric Use
The safety and effectiveness of OFIRMEV for the treatment of acute pain and fever in pediatric patients ages 2 years and older is supported by evidence from adequate and well-controlled studies of OFIRMEV in adults. Additional safety and pharmacokinetic data are not available for any other pediatric age group.

Geriatric Use
The total number of subjects in clinical studies of OFIRMEV, 15% were aged 65 years of age and older, while 1% were aged 75 years or older, and there were no apparent differences in responses between the elderly and younger patients, but greater sensitivity of some older individuals cannot be ruled out.

Patients with Hepatic Impairment
Acetaminophen is contraindicated in patients with severe hepatic impairment or severe active liver disease. There is a reduced total daily dose of acetaminophen may be warranted.

OVERDOSAGE
Signs and Symptoms
In acute acetaminophen overdose, dose-dependent, potentially fatal hepatic necrosis is the most serious adverse effect. Renal tubular necrosis, hypoglycemia, coma, and thrombocytopenia may also occur. Plasma acetaminophen levels > 30 mg/mL at 4 hours after oral ingestion are associated with hepatic damage in 95% of patients; minimal hepatic damage is anticipated if plasma levels at 4 hours are < 15 mg/mL (or ≤ 37.5 μM). After 12 hours after ingestion. Early signs following a potentially hepatotoxic overdose may include nausea, vomiting, diaphoresis, and general malaise. Clinical and laboratory evidence of hepatic toxicity may not be apparent until 12 to 14 hours post-ingestion.

PHARMACOKINETICS
The pharmacokinetics of OFIRMEV have been studied in patients and healthy subjects from premature neonates to adults up to 60 years old. The pharmacokinetic profile of OFIRMEV has been demonstrated to be dose proportional in adults following administration. AUC of 650 mg or 1000 mg.
The maximum concentration (Cmax) occurs at the end of the 15 minute intravenous infusion of OFIRMEV. Compared to the same dose of oral acetaminophen, the Cmax following administration of OFIRMEV is at 70% higher, while overall exposure (area under the concentration time curve [AUC]) is very similar.
The pharmacokinetic exposure of OFIRMEV observed in children and adolescents is similar to adults, but higher in neonates and infants. Dosing simulations from pharmacokinetic data in infants and neonates suggest that dose reductions of 35% in infants 1 month to < 2 years of age, and 50% in children 6 to 26 months of age, with a minimum of 4 hours, would produce a pharmacokinetic exposure similar to that observed in children aged 2 years and older.

CLINICAL TOXICOLOGY
Carcinogenesis
Long-term studies in mice and rats have been completed by the National Toxicology Program using the National Toxicology Program standard battery of tests. An intraperitoneal administration of acetaminophen caused hepatic tumors in mice. In 2-year feeding studies, 13344 rats and 66281 mice were fed a diet containing acetaminophen up to 6600 ppm. Female rats demonstrated equivocal evidence of carcinogenic activity based on increased incidences of mononuclear cell leukemia at 0.8 times the maximum human daily dose (MOHD) of 4 grams/day, based on a body surface area comparison. In contrast, there was no evidence of carcinogenic activity in male rats (0.77 times) or mice (1.2-1.4 times the MOHD, based on a body surface area comparison).

Mutagenesis
Acetaminophen was not mutagenic in the bacterial reverse mutation assay (Ames test). In contrast, acetaminophen tested positive in the in vitro mouse lymphoma assay and in vitro chromosomal aberration assay using human lymphocytes. In the published literature, acetaminophen has been reported to be clastogenic when administered a dose of 1000 mg/kg/day for 10 days in the mouse (1.6-4.5 times the MOHD based on a body surface area comparison). In contrast, no clastogenicity was noted at a dose of 750 mg/kg/day (1.8 times the MOHD, based on a body surface area comparison), suggesting a threshold effect.

Impairment of fertility
In studies conducted by the National Toxicology Program, fertility assessments have been completed in Swiss mice via a continuous breeding regimen. There were no effects on fertility parameters in mice consuming up to 1.7 times the MOHD of acetaminophen, based on a body surface area comparison. Although there was no effect on sperm motility or sperm density in the epididymis, there was a significant increase in the percentage of abnormal sperm in mice consuming 1.7 times the MOHD (based on a body surface area comparison) and there was a reduction in the number of mating pairs producing a fifth litter at this dose, suggesting the potential for cumulative toxicity with chronic administration of acetaminophen near the upper limit of daily dosing.

Published studies in rodents report that oral administration of acetaminophen treatment of male animals at doses of 1.2 times the MOHD and greater based on a body surface area comparison resulted in weight loss, reduced spermatogenesis, reduced fertility, and reduced implantations in females given the same doses. These effects appear to increase with the duration of treatment. The clinical significance of these findings is not known. OFIRMEV (acetaminophen) injection
Manufactured For:
Oarged Pharmaceutical, Inc., San Diego, CA 92130

Reconstructive Review • October 2011
www.jsrsf.org