ICM 2025 Question B19: "Does delivery of local antibiotics have any influence in removal of biofilm in orthopedic infections?"

Kohei Nishitani, Kordo Saeed, Goh Ohji, Christian Fuentes Bazan, Ye Ye, Yugo Morita, Ferdinando Iannotti

---

Response/Recommendation: Although the potential role of local delivery of antibiotics in combatting biofilm has been explored in some studies, due to lack of high-level evidence, we cannot provide either a supportive or oppositional recommendation on this topic.

Level of Evidence: Weak

Delegate Vote: Agree: [% vote], Disagree: [%], Abstain: [%]

Rationale: Implant-associated infection is one of the most devastating complications following orthopedic surgeries [1]. In such infections, biofilm formation on the implant surface plays a critical role by providing bacteria with a protective environment that allows them to evade host immunity and antibiotic treatment [2]. Once a biofilm formation is completed, it is widely accepted among orthopedic surgeons that the infection becomes highly intractable, often necessitating additional surgical interventions such as debridement, irrigation and drainage, or implant removal [3].

After biofilm formation, the antibiotic concentration required to address the infection increases dramatically compared to the minimum inhibitory concentration (MIC), the minimum concentration necessary to eradicate a biofilm is termed the minimum biofilm eradication concentration (MBEC) [4,5]. Since MBEC values are extraordinarily higher than MIC values, achieving such concentrations through systemic administration is nearly impossible.

In this manuscript, we examine whether biofilms on implant surfaces can be effectively removed through local antibiotic administration, with evidence drawn from 1) *in vitro* studies, 2) *in vivo* animal studies, and 3) *in vivo* human studies. To address this, a comprehensive literature search of the PubMed, Scopus and CINAHL databases, was conducted using MeSH terms developed by librarians. The search initially identifying 252 potentially relevant unique studies. These publications were, screened by two independent reviewers, and of which 83 final publications were selected for in-depth review and 28 included for final evaluation. It should be noted that, this manuscript focuses on whether antimicrobial agents can remove biofilms that have formed, and therefore excludes papers on whether antimicrobial agents can prevent or inhibit biofilm formation. Even in the absence of direct evidence of biofilm removal, the eradication of bacteria from biofilms or clinical cures achieved with implant retention were considered indirect indications of biofilm removal.

Among the eight extracted in vitro studies, four focused solely on the inhibition of biofilm formation [6–9]. Additionally, one study focused on biofilm removal but investigated the effects of antiseptic solutions, such as Povidone-iodine, instead of antibiotics [10]. Three studies evaluated the effect of antibiotics on biofilm removal [11–13]. In all three studies evaluating biofilm removal, biofilms were formed in vitro, while one study also included an in vivo biofilm model formed on a rat femur. All three studies utilized gentamicin in their experiments, and two studies also evaluated vancomycin. Regarding the bacteria responsible for biofilm formation,

Staphylococcus aureus (*S. aureus*) was used in all studies. Dall et al. investigated the recovery of *S. aureus* from biofilms formed over 24 hours using the dissolvable bead biofilm assay [11]. The MBEC was determined for commonly used antimicrobial agents and combination regimens, including gentamicin, daptomycin, ciprofloxacin, vancomycin, rifampicin, clindamycin, and linezolid. Among these, only gentamicin and daptomycin were found to be effective. The study also reported on effective and ineffective combinations of antibiotics in enhancing or diminishing the activity of gentamicin or daptomycin. Okae et al. examined the effects of locally administered doses of gentamicin, vancomycin, and cefazolin, with or without systemic doses of vancomycin and rifampicin, against *S. aureus* in both *in vitro* and *in vivo* biofilms formed on stainless steel implants [13]. In the in vivo biofilm model, biofilms were formed on implant surfaces using a rat femoral osteomyelitis model over 3 and 14 days. In a CFU recovery assay, MBEC values for in vivo biofilms were higher than those for in vitro biofilms. Moreover, MBEC values for 14-day biofilms were higher than those for 3-day biofilms, indicating that the complexity and maturation of biofilms increase the concentration of antibiotics required to eliminate bacteria within the biofilm. Sekar et al. described the synergistic antibacterial effects of gentamicin and ketorolac in reducing *S. aureus* and *S. epidermidis* in in vitro biofilms formed over 6 and 24 hours [12]. The effects of these drugs were assessed using CFU assays, live-dead staining, and SEM. Notably, the study highlighted that the longer a biofilm matures, the more challenging its removal becomes. Conversely, prolonged exposure of biofilms to antibiotics resulted in greater efficacy. This aspect is supported by the work of Castaneda et al. who reported that MBEC is lower when local antimicrobial exposure time is longer [14]. In addition, Moore et al. found that antibiotic-loaded calcium sulfate beads containing vancomycin and tobramycin may be more effective in treating multispecies biofilms than single antibiotic alone [15].

Nine *in vivo* animal studies were reviewed. Five studies were outside the scope of this review [16–20] . One study established an implant-related infection model and performed revision surgery with local antibiotics treatment, where the biofilm on the implant was surgically removed [21]. Another study evaluated biofilm removal with implant retain, but specifically focused on the effects of protease treatment [22]. Two studies initiated local antimicrobial treatment after biofilm formation while retaining the implant [23,24]. Regarding experimental animals, both studies used rats as their models. For bacterial selection to induce infection, both studies employed *S. aureus.* Penn-Barwell described an implant-stabilized segmental defect rat model contaminated with *S. aureus* [24]. They used local administration of Bismuth thiol in hydrogel with systemic cefazolin, and showed decreased bacterial recovery at 14 days. However, although a 6-hour interval was allowed for bacterial biofilm establishment prior to initiating local treatment, this duration may have been insufficient for robust biofilm formation. Ashar et al. initiated treatment 10 days post-infection in a femoral canal implant model inoculated with methicillin-resistant *S. aureus* [23] . They employed a combination of ciprofloxacin-laden low-temperature-sensitive liposomes and local high-intensity focused ultrasound. Although complete eradication was not achieved, the treatment significantly reduced CFUs. Notably, they presented SEM images showing a reduction in bacterial burden and biofilm formation compared to other treatment groups.

Eleven human *in vivo* studies were reviewed, five studies were either prevention studies, involved no residual implant, did not address implant-related infections, or were methodological

papers without presenting results [25–29] . Six of which focused on the treatment of established biofilm-related implant infections using local antibiotic therapy while retaining the implant [30–35]. All six studies were case series, with the number of patients ranging from 2 to 10. Surgical interventions commonly included debridement, irrigation, continuous local antibiotic perfusion (CLAP) or local antibiotic delivery, replacement of modular components, and negative pressure wound therapy (NPWT), with a primary emphasis on infection control and implant preservation. The studies targeted a wide range of pathogens, including methicillin-resistant *S. aureus*, methicillin-sensitive *S. aureus*, *Cutibacterium acnes*, *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*, and other resistant bacterial strains. Local antibiotic perfusion therapies predominantly utilized gentamicin. The outcomes demonstrated effective infection control. Implant preservation was mostly achieved. Although direct evidence of biofilm removal was not provided, the successful retention of implants may indirectly indicate the potential of local antibiotic therapies to eradicate bacteria within biofilms, a critical requirement for curing implant-associated infections. Beyond the studies included in the review, numerous other reports/ case series have demonstrated the successful local administration of antibiotics, highlighting the potential efficacy of local antibiotic therapies [36]. Indelli et al. also reported the successful outcomes of a multimodal strategy for the salvage of acutely infected arthroplasty in 62 patients, incorporating local antibiotic administration by calcium sulfate beads [37]. The use of local antibiotics may play a role if applied as part of a multimodal approach rather than on its own.

In conclusion, although numerous *in vitro,* animal studies, and human studies have focused on infection prevention and inhibition of biofilm formation in implant-associated orthopedic infections, only a small number of basic studies have addressed the removal of established biofilms using local antibiotic administration. While some studies have suggested the potential of local antibiotics, there is a lack of clarity regarding the types and doses of antibiotics required for effective biofilm removal through local treatment. Most research has focused on *S. aureus*, with limited investigations into gram-negative bacteria and mixed infections, highlighting a significant gap in the literature. Furthermore, the scope of antibiotics studied is narrow, with insufficient exploration of novel therapeutic agents. In human studies, although several case reports have described the effectiveness of local antibiotic treatments, no research with a high level of evidence was identified. We believe that the current evidence is insufficient to reach either a supportive or oppositional consensus on this research question. However,

References:

1. Schwarz EM, Parvizi J, Gehrke T, Aiyer A, Battenberg A, Brown SA, et al. 2018 International Consensus Meeting on Musculoskeletal Infection: Research Priorities from the General Assembly Questions. J Orthop Res. 2019;37(5):997-1006. .

2. Tomizawa T, Nishitani K, Ito H, Okae Y, Morita Y, Doi K, et al. The limitations of mono- and combination antibiotic therapies on immature biofilms in a murine model of implant-associated osteomyelitis. J Orthop Res. 2021;39(2):449–57.

3. Masters EA, Trombetta RP, Bentley KL de M, Boyce BF, Gill AL, Gill SR, et al. Evolving concepts in bone infection: redefining “biofilm”, “acute vs. chronic osteomyelitis”, “the immune proteome” and “local antibiotic therapy”. Bone Res. 2019;7(1):20–18.

4. Mottola C, Matias CS, Mendes JJ, Melo-Cristino J, Tavares L, Cavaco-Silva P, et al. Susceptibility patterns of Staphylococcus aureus biofilms in diabetic foot infections. Bmc Microbiol. 2016;16(1):119.

5. Schwarz EM, McLaren AC, Sculco TP, Brause B, Bostrom M, Kates SL, et al. Adjuvant antibiotic-loaded bone cement: Concerns with current use and research to make it work. J Orthop Res. 2020 Mar 2;94(2):1–13.

6. Neut D, Hendriks JGE, Horn JR van, Mei HC van der, Busscher HJ. Pseudomonas aeruginosa biofilm formation and slime excretion on antibiotic-loaded bone cement. Acta Orthop. 2009;76(1):109–14.

7. Zoccali C, Contestabile M, Segni SD, Nuvoli B, Prencipe U, Erba F. A Comparison of Antibiotic Release between a Cement Scaffold, a Perforated Cement Scaffold and a Cement Scaffold Mixed to Calcium Sulphate: In vitro Study. Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol. 2011;24(1_suppl2):7–9.

8. Li Y, Liu YZ, Long T, Yu XB, Tang T, Dai KR, et al. Mesoporous bioactive glass as a drug delivery system: fabrication, bactericidal properties and biocompatibility. J Mater Sci: Mater Med. 2013;24(8):1951–61.

9. Karacan I, Ben-Nissan B, Santos J, Yiu S, Bradbury P, Valenzuela SM, et al. In vitro testing and efficacy of poly-lactic acid coating incorporating antibiotic loaded coralline bioceramic on Ti6Al4V implant against Staphylococcus aureus. J Tissue Eng Regen Med. 2022;16(12):1149–62.

10. O'Donnell JA, Wu M, Cochrane NH, Belay E, Myntti MF, James GA, et al. Efficacy of common antiseptic solutions against clinically relevant microorganisms in biofilm. Bone Joint J. 2021;103-B(5):908–15.

11. Dall GF, Tsang STJ, Gwynne PJ, MacKenzie SP, Simpson AHRW, Breusch SJ, et al. Unexpected synergistic and antagonistic antibiotic activity against Staphylococcus biofilms. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2018;73(7):1830–40.

12. Sekar A, Gil D, Tierney P, McCanne M, Daesety V, Trendafilova D, et al. Synergistic use of anti-inflammatory ketorolac and gentamicin to target staphylococcal biofilms. J Transl Med. 2024;22(1):102.

13. Okae Y, Nishitani K, Sakamoto A, Kawai T, Tomizawa T, Saito M, et al. Estimation of Minimum Biofilm Eradication Concentration (MBEC) on In Vivo Biofilm on Orthopedic Implants in a Rodent Femoral Infection Model. Front Cell Infect Microbiol. 2022;12:896978.

14. Castaneda P, McLaren A, Tavaziva G, Overstreet D. Biofilm Antimicrobial Susceptibility Increases With Antimicrobial Exposure Time. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2016;474(7):1659–64.

15. Moore K, Li A, Gupta N, Gupta TT, Delury C, Aiken SS, et al. Killing of a Multispecies Biofilm Using Gram-Negative and Gram-Positive Targeted Antibiotic Released from High Purity Calcium Sulfate Beads. Microorganisms. 2023;11(9):2296.

16. Jennings JA, Carpenter DP, Troxel KS, Beenken KE, Smeltzer MS, Courtney HS, et al. Novel Antibiotic-loaded Point-of-care Implant Coating Inhibits Biofilm. Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2015;473(7):2270–82.

17. Wang J, Li J, Qian S, Guo G, Wang Q, Tang J, et al. Antibacterial Surface Design of Titanium-Based Biomaterials for Enhanced Bacteria-Killing and Cell-Assisting Functions Against Periprosthetic Joint Infection. ACS Appl Mater Interfaces. 2016;8(17):11162–78.

18. Shiels SM, Tennent DJ, Akers KS, Wenke JC. Determining potential of PMMA as a depot for rifampin to treat recalcitrant orthopaedic infections. Injury. 2017;48(10):2095–100.

19. Marston S, Mueller GM, Sabin A, Hansen GT, Lindgren B, Aparicio C, et al. Systemic versus free antibiotic delivery in preventing acute exogenous implant related infection in a rat model. J Orthop Res. 2022;40(2):429–38.

20. Boles LR, Awais R, Beenken KE, Smeltzer MS, Haggard WO, Jessica AJ. Local Delivery of Amikacin and Vancomycin from Chitosan Sponges Prevent Polymicrobial Implant-Associated Biofilm. Mil Med. 2018;183(suppl_1):459–65.

21. Boot W, Schmid T, D'Este M, Guillaume O, Foster A, Decosterd L, et al. A Hyaluronic Acid Hydrogel Loaded with Gentamicin and Vancomycin Successfully Eradicates Chronic Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Orthopedic Infection in a Sheep Model. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2021;65(4):10.1128/aac.01840-20.

22. Mecikoglu M, Saygi B, Yildirim Y, Karadag-Saygi E, Ramadan SS, Esemenli T. The Effect of Proteolytic Enzyme Serratiopeptidase in the Treatment of Experimental Implant-Related Infection. J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2006;88(6):1208–14.

23. Ashar H, Singh A, Ektate K, More S, Ranjan A. Treating methicillin-resistant Staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) bone infection with focused ultrasound combined thermally sensitive liposomes. Int J Hyperth. 2023;40(1):2211278.

24. Penn-Barwell JG, Baker B, Wenke JC. Local Bismuth Thiols Potentiate Antibiotics and Reduce Infection in a Contaminated Open Fracture Model. J Orthop Trauma. 2015;29(2):e73–8.

25. Malizos K, Blauth M, Danita A, Capuano N, Mezzoprete R, Logoluso N, et al. Fast-resorbable antibiotic-loaded hydrogel coating to reduce post-surgical infection after internal osteosynthesis: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. J Orthop Traumatol. 2017;18(2):159–69.

26. O'Toole RV, Joshi M, Carlini AR, Murray CK, Allen LE, Scharfstein DO, et al. Local Antibiotic Therapy to Reduce Infection After Operative Treatment of Fractures at High Risk of Infection. J Orthop Trauma. 2017;31(NA;):S18–24.

27. Springer BD, Higuera-Rueda CA, Beaubien BC de, Warner KD, Glassman AH, Parvataneni HK, et al. Safety Profile of Seven-Day Intra-articular Antibiotic Irrigation for the Treatment of Chronic Periprosthetic Joint Infection: A Prospective Randomized Phase II Comparative Study. J Arthroplasty. 2024;39(9):S229-S235.e1.

28. Stravinskas M, Horstmann P, Ferguson J, Hettwer W, Nilsson M, Tarasevicius S, et al. Pharmacokinetics of gentamicin eluted from a regenerating bone graft substitute. Bone Joint Res. 2016;5(9):427–35.

29. Wahl P, Guidi M, Benninger E, Rönn K, Gautier E, Buclin T, et al. The levels of vancomycin in the blood and the wound after the local treatment of bone and soft-tissue infection with antibiotic-loaded calcium sulphate as carrier material. Bone Joint J. 2017;99-B(11):1537–44.

30. Choe H, Maruo A, Hieda Y, Abe K, Kobayashi N, Ike H, et al. Novel Local Antifungal Treatment for Fungal Periprosthetic Joint Infection With Continuous Local Antibiotic Perfusion: A Surgical Technique. Arthroplast Today. 2023;24:101245.

31. Kosugi K, Zenke Y, Sato N, Hamada D, Ando K, Okada Y, et al. Potential of Continuous Local Antibiotic Perfusion Therapy for Fracture-Related Infections. Infect Dis Ther. 2022;11(4):1741–55.

32. Miyake Y, Takagi T. Treatment experience with continuous local antibiotic perfusion for periprosthetic joint infection. J Orthop Sci. 2024;29(6):1469–76.

33. Shimada Y, Ochiai N, Hashimoto E, Kajiwara D, Hiraoka Y, Inagaki K, et al. Continuous local antibiotic perfusion technique for surgical site infections after shoulder surgery. JSES Rev, Rep, Tech. 2024;4(3):419–23.

34. Shimbo K, Saiki T, Kawamoto H, Koshima I. Implant salvage in patients with severe post-fracture fixation surgical site infection using negative pressure wound therapy with intramedullary and subcutaneous antibiotic perfusion. Wounds 2022;34(6):E47–51.

35. Maruo A, Oda T, Miya H, Muratsu H, Fukui T, Oe K, et al. Intra-medullary antibiotics perfusion (iMAP) for the control of fracture-related infection early after osteosynthesis. J Orthop Surg. 2021;29(3):23094990211051492.

36. Jarusriwanna A, Mu W, Parvizi J. Local Antibiotic Infusion in Periprosthetic Joint Infection Following Total Hip Arthroplasty. J Clin Med. 2024;13(16):4848.

37. Indelli PF, Ghirardelli S, Valpiana P, Bini L, Festini M, Iannotti F. Debridement, Antibiotic Pearls, and Retention of the Implant (DAPRI) in the Treatment of Early Periprosthetic Joint Infections: A Consecutive Series. Pathogens. 2023;12(4):605.