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A B S T R A C T

Background: In the setting of aseptic revision, a common question is: what should be done with the previously resurfaced patella? We report on a series of aseptic revision total knee arthroplasties (RTKA) where one or both components were revised and the patella was not.

Methods: The study group was 147 consecutive RTKA in 137 patients with a mean age of 70.1 ± 9.3 years where the patella was not revised. The average body mass index was 31.0 ± 5.4 kg/m². Follow-up was a minimum of 5 years (range, 5 to 12 years). At final follow-up, 13 patients died and 2 patients were lost to follow-up leaving 122 patients and 130 knees available for review. Mean time from primary surgery to RTKA was 9.2 ± 5.5 years. Both components were revised in 50 knees, the femur only in 11 knees, the tibia only in 12 knees, and 57 had an isolated polyethylene revision. We found 5 patients with a mismatch between the patella and femoral components and 30 cases with patella component wear identified intraoperatively.

Results: At final follow-up, there were no reoperations on any patella and none were at risk of failure. There were 6 knees with a lateral patella tilt beyond 10°, but none were subluxed. Knee Society Scores averaged 85 ± 17.2 points at final follow-up.

Conclusion: At midterm follow-up in this group of RTKA where the patella was not revised, we identified no subsequent failures of the patella. This is despite the presence of mild patella polyethylene wear and mismatched shapes in several knees.

Level of Evidence: III.