



Clinical Outcomes of 3D-Printed Custom Implants in Complex Orthopedic Reconstruction

Dr. Kenneth O'Brien^{1*}, Dr. Ahmed Z Farouk², Dr. Pierre Dubois³

¹ Department of Orthopedics and Sports Medicine, Stanford University, USA

² Department of Orthopedics, Cairo University, Egypt

³ Orthopedic Research Institute, University of Montreal, Canada

* Corresponding Author: Dr. Kenneth O'Brien

Article Info

Volume: 01

Issue: 02

March-April 2025

Received: 08-03-2025

Accepted: 02-04-2025

Page No: 06-09

Abstract

Background: Complex orthopedic reconstruction presents significant challenges due to anatomical variations and the limitations of conventional implants. Three-dimensional (3D) printing technology has emerged as a revolutionary approach for creating patient-specific implants that address these challenges.

Objective: To evaluate the clinical outcomes, complications, and patient satisfaction associated with 3D-printed custom implants in complex orthopedic reconstruction procedures.

Methods: A retrospective analysis was conducted on 127 patients who underwent complex orthopedic reconstruction using 3D-printed custom implants between January 2020 and December 2023. Patient demographics, surgical parameters, functional outcomes, complications, and radiographic assessments were analyzed. Follow-up ranged from 12 to 48 months.

Results: The study included 127 patients (mean age 52.3 ± 15.7 years). Surgical indications included bone tumor resections ($n=45$), revision arthroplasty ($n=38$), trauma reconstruction ($n=28$), and congenital deformities ($n=16$). Mean operative time was 3.2 ± 1.1 hours. Implant integration was achieved in 94.5% of cases. Complications occurred in 11.8% of patients, with infection being the most common (4.7%). Functional scores improved significantly from preoperative to final follow-up ($p<0.001$). Patient satisfaction rates were 91.3%.

Conclusion: 3D-printed custom implants demonstrate excellent clinical outcomes in complex orthopedic reconstruction, with high integration rates, acceptable complication rates, and significant functional improvements. This technology represents a paradigm shift toward personalized orthopedic care.

Keywords: 3D printing, custom implants, orthopedic reconstruction, patient-specific implants, additive manufacturing, bone reconstruction

Introduction

Complex orthopedic reconstruction represents one of the most challenging areas in musculoskeletal surgery, encompassing procedures for bone tumor resections, revision arthroplasty, severe trauma reconstruction, and congenital deformities. Traditional reconstruction methods using conventional implants often face limitations due to anatomical variations, bone defect complexity, and the mismatch between standard implant designs and patient-specific anatomy^[1,2]. These limitations frequently result in suboptimal fit, compromised biomechanical function, and increased risk of complications.

The advent of three-dimensional (3D) printing technology, also known as additive manufacturing, has revolutionized the approach to complex orthopedic reconstruction. This technology enables the creation of patient-specific implants that are precisely designed based on individual anatomical data obtained from computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) scans^[3,4].

The ability to customize implants according to each patient's unique anatomy offers several theoretical advantages, including improved fit, enhanced osseointegration, reduced operative time, and better functional outcomes.

3D printing in orthopedics utilizes various materials, with titanium alloys being the most commonly employed due to their excellent biocompatibility, mechanical properties, and osseointegration capabilities [5]. The manufacturing process involves layer-by-layer construction using techniques such as selective laser melting (SLM) or electron beam melting (EBM), which allow for the creation of complex geometries and porous structures that promote bone ingrowth [6].

Recent advances in 3D printing technology have expanded its applications in orthopedic surgery beyond simple implant fabrication. Modern techniques enable the incorporation of bioactive coatings, variable porosity gradients, and integrated drug delivery systems within the implant structure [7,8]. These innovations have the potential to further improve clinical outcomes and reduce complications associated with orthopedic reconstruction procedures.

Despite the promising theoretical advantages and technological capabilities, comprehensive clinical outcome data for 3D-printed custom implants in complex orthopedic reconstruction remains limited. Most existing studies focus on specific anatomical regions or small patient cohorts, making it difficult to draw broad conclusions about the overall efficacy and safety of this technology [9,10]. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the clinical outcomes, complications, and patient satisfaction associated with 3D-printed custom implants across various complex orthopedic reconstruction procedures in a large patient cohort with extended follow-up.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Patient Selection

This retrospective cohort study was conducted at a tertiary referral orthopedic center following institutional review board approval. Patients who underwent complex orthopedic reconstruction using 3D-printed custom implants between January 2020 and December 2023 were identified from the institutional database. Inclusion criteria comprised patients aged 18 years or older who received 3D-printed custom implants for complex reconstruction procedures with a minimum follow-up of 12 months. Exclusion criteria included patients with incomplete medical records, active infection at the time of surgery, or those lost to follow-up within the first 12 months postoperatively.

3D Printing Process and Implant Design

All custom implants were manufactured using selective laser melting technology with medical-grade titanium alloy (Ti-6Al-4V). The design process began with high-resolution CT imaging using 1mm slice thickness. Digital imaging and communications in medicine (DICOM) data were processed using specialized software to create three-dimensional anatomical models. Implant design was performed collaboratively between orthopedic surgeons and biomedical engineers, incorporating patient-specific anatomical features and biomechanical requirements.

Each implant underwent rigorous quality control testing, including dimensional accuracy assessment, surface roughness analysis, and mechanical property evaluation. Sterile packaging and delivery were completed within 2-3 weeks of final design approval.

Surgical Technique

All procedures were performed by experienced orthopedic surgeons familiar with 3D-printed implant technology. Surgical approach varied according to anatomical location and reconstruction requirements. Standard principles of aseptic technique, adequate exposure, and meticulous soft tissue handling were maintained throughout all procedures. Implant positioning was verified using intraoperative imaging, and primary stability was assessed before wound closure.

Outcome Measures

Primary outcome measures included implant integration rates, complication rates, and functional outcome scores. Secondary measures comprised operative parameters, radiographic assessments, and patient satisfaction scores. Functional outcomes were evaluated using validated scoring systems appropriate for each anatomical region, including the Harris Hip Score for hip reconstructions, Knee Society Score for knee procedures, and Musculoskeletal Tumor Society (MSTS) score for oncological reconstructions.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS version 28.0. Continuous variables were expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation, while categorical variables were presented as frequencies and percentages. Pre- and postoperative functional scores were compared using paired t-tests. Statistical significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Results

Patient Demographics and Surgical Indications

The study included 127 patients with a mean age of 52.3 ± 15.7 years (range: 18-78 years). The cohort comprised 68 males (53.5%) and 59 females (46.5%). Mean follow-up duration was 28.4 ± 11.2 months (range: 12-48 months). Surgical indications are detailed in Table 1, with bone tumor resections being the most common indication (35.4%), followed by revision arthroplasty (29.9%).

Table 1: Patient Demographics and Surgical Indications

Characteristic	n (%)
Age (years)	52.3 ± 15.7
Gender	
Male	68 (53.5)
Female	59 (46.5)
Surgical Indication	
Bone tumor resection	45 (35.4)
Revision arthroplasty	38 (29.9)
Trauma reconstruction	28 (22.0)
Congenital deformity	16 (12.6)
Anatomical Location	
Pelvis/acetabulum	42 (33.1)
Femur	31 (24.4)
Tibia	23 (18.1)
Humerus	18 (14.2)
Other	13 (10.2)

Surgical Parameters and Implant Characteristics

Mean operative time was 3.2 ± 1.1 hours, which compared favorably to historical controls using conventional reconstruction methods. Mean implant volume was 45.7 ± 28.3 cm³, reflecting the diverse range of reconstruction

requirements. All implants featured porous surface architecture designed to promote osseointegration, with porosity ranging from 60-80%.

Clinical Outcomes

Implant integration, defined as radiographic evidence of bone

ingrowth and absence of implant loosening, was achieved in 120 patients (94.5%). Mean time to integration was 4.8 ± 2.1 months. Functional outcome scores showed significant improvement from preoperative to final follow-up across all patient groups (Table 2).

Table 2: Functional Outcome Scores

Score	Preoperative	Final Follow-up	p-value
Harris Hip Score (n=42)	32.4 ± 8.7	78.3 ± 12.1	<0.001
Knee Society Score (n=23)	28.9 ± 9.2	76.8 ± 14.3	<0.001
MSTS Score (n=45)	45.2 ± 11.8	83.7 ± 9.4	<0.001
Overall Function Score	35.1 ± 10.2	79.6 ± 12.1	<0.001

Complications

Complications occurred in 15 patients (11.8%), as detailed in Table 3. Infection was the most common complication, occurring in 6 patients (4.7%). All infections were successfully treated with antibiotic therapy, with only one case requiring implant removal and staged reconstruction.

Table 3: Complications

Complication	n (%)
Infection	6 (4.7)
Implant loosening	3 (2.4)
Fracture	2 (1.6)
Nerve injury	2 (1.6)
Wound healing problems	2 (1.6)
Total	15 (11.8)

Patient Satisfaction

Patient satisfaction was assessed using a 10-point visual analog scale, with 116 patients (91.3%) reporting satisfaction scores of 7 or higher. Mean satisfaction score was 8.4 ± 1.7 . Patients particularly appreciated the improved function and reduced pain compared to their preoperative status.

Discussion

This study represents one of the largest reported series evaluating clinical outcomes of 3D-printed custom implants in complex orthopedic reconstruction. The results demonstrate excellent clinical outcomes with high integration rates (94.5%), acceptable complication rates (11.8%), and significant functional improvements across all patient groups.

The high integration rate observed in this study can be attributed to several factors inherent to 3D-printed custom implants. The precise anatomical fit achieved through patient-specific design minimizes stress concentrations and promotes uniform load distribution^[11]. Additionally, the porous surface architecture incorporated into all implants provides an optimal environment for bone ingrowth and long-term fixation^[12].

The complication rate of 11.8% compares favorably to historical reports of conventional reconstruction methods, which typically report complication rates ranging from 15-25% for similar complex procedures^[13]. The infection rate of 4.7% is particularly encouraging, as infection represents one of the most feared complications in orthopedic reconstruction. The low infection rate may be partially attributed to reduced operative time and improved implant fit, which minimizes dead space and potential bacterial colonization sites.

Functional outcome improvements were significant across all

anatomical locations and surgical indications. The substantial improvement in functional scores reflects not only the technical success of the implants but also their ability to restore biomechanical function effectively. Patients with tumor reconstructions showed particularly impressive functional gains, likely due to the ability of custom implants to restore normal anatomy more precisely than conventional modular systems^[14].

The economic implications of 3D-printed custom implants warrant consideration. While the initial cost of custom implants is higher than conventional alternatives, the potential for reduced complications, shorter operative times, and improved long-term outcomes may result in overall cost savings from a healthcare system perspective^[15]. Future health economic analyses will be essential to fully evaluate the cost-effectiveness of this technology.

Several limitations of this study should be acknowledged. The retrospective design introduces potential selection bias, and the heterogeneous nature of the patient population makes direct comparisons challenging. Additionally, longer-term follow-up will be necessary to evaluate the durability of these implants and identify potential late complications.

Future directions for 3D-printed orthopedic implants include the development of bioactive surfaces, incorporation of antimicrobial properties, and integration of smart technologies for real-time monitoring of implant performance. These advances have the potential to further improve clinical outcomes and expand the applications of custom implant technology.

Conclusion

3D-printed custom implants demonstrate excellent clinical outcomes in complex orthopedic reconstruction procedures. High integration rates, acceptable complication rates, and significant functional improvements support the continued development and application of this technology. The ability to create patient-specific implants represents a paradigm shift toward personalized orthopedic care, offering solutions for previously challenging reconstruction scenarios. As manufacturing techniques continue to evolve and costs decrease, 3D-printed custom implants are likely to become increasingly prevalent in complex orthopedic reconstruction. Long-term studies will be essential to establish the durability and cost-effectiveness of this promising technology.

References

1. Angelini A, Trovarelli G, Berizzi A, Pala E, Breda A, Ruggieri P. Three-dimensional printing in orthopedic

- surgery: current applications and future developments. *J Biol Regul Homeost Agents*. 2018;32(6 Suppl 1):165-175.
2. Wixted JJ, Fanning JJ, Gadomski BC. Three-dimensional printing in orthopedic surgery: current applications and future trends. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*. 2021;29(1):e1-e10.
 3. Javaid M, Haleem A. 3D printed tissue and organ using additive manufacturing: an overview. *Clin Epidemiol Glob Health*. 2020;8(2):586-594.
 4. Ma H, Feng C, Chang J, Wu C. 3D-printed bioceramic scaffolds: from bone tissue engineering to tumor therapy. *Acta Biomater*. 2018;79:37-59.
 5. Sidambe AT. Biocompatibility of advanced manufactured titanium implants—a review. *Materials*. 2014;7(12):8168-8188.
 6. Wang X, Xu S, Zhou S, *et al*. Topological design and additive manufacturing of porous metals for bone scaffolds and orthopaedic implants. *Biomaterials*. 2016;83:127-141.
 7. Bartolomeu F, Buciumeanu M, Pinto E, *et al*. 316L stainless steel mechanical and tribological behavior—a comparison between selective laser melting, hot pressing and conventional casting. *Addit Manuf*. 2017;16:81-89.
 8. Li JP, Li SH, Van Blitterswijk CA, de Groot K. A novel porous Ti6Al4V: characterization and cell attachment. *J Biomed Mater Res A*. 2005;73(2):223-233.
 9. Pobloth AM, Checa S, Razi H, *et al*. Mechanobiologically optimized 3D titanium-mesh scaffolds enhance bone regeneration in critical segmental defects in sheep. *Sci Transl Med*. 2018;10(423):eaam8828.
 10. Eltorai AE, Nguyen E, Daniels AH. Three-dimensional printing in orthopedic surgery. *Orthopedics*. 2015;38(11):684-687.
 11. Jardini AL, Larosa MA, Filho RM, *et al*. Cranial reconstruction: 3D biomodel and custom-built implant created using additive manufacturing. *J Craniomaxillofac Surg*. 2014;42(8):1877-1884.
 12. Murr LE, Gaytan SM, Medina F, *et al*. Next-generation biomedical implants using additive manufacturing of complex cellular and functional mesh arrays. *Philos Trans A Math Phys Eng Sci*. 2010;368(1917):1999-2032.
 13. Papagelopoulos PJ, Mavrogenis AF, Aldlyami E, *et al*. Outcomes after limb-salvage surgery for primary bone sarcomas at the knee. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2006;450:33-38.
 14. Liang H, Ji T, Zhang Y, Wang Y, Guo W. Reconstruction with 3D-printed pelvic endoprostheses after resection of a pelvic tumour. *Bone Joint J*. 2017;99-B(2):267-275.
 15. Tack P, Victor J, Gemmel P, Annemans L. 3D-printing techniques in a medical setting: a systematic literature review. *Biomed Eng Online*. 2016;15(1):115.