Pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis: a systematic review

E. RUBENS¹, F. VAN GLABBEEK^{2,3}, J.G. DE MAN⁴, G. PEERSMAN⁵, B.Y. DE WINTER⁴, G. HUBENS^{3,6}, J. MICHIELSEN^{2,3}, P. PLAEKE^{3,4,6}

1 Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium; 2 Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium; 3 Antwerp Surgical Training, Anatomy and Research Centre (ASTARC), University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium; 4 Laboratory of Experimental Medicine and Pediatrics (LEMP), University of Antwerp, Wilrijk, Belgium; ⁵Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Stuivenberg Hospital, Antwerp, *Belgium; 6 Department of Abdominal Surgery, Antwerp University Hospital, Edegem, Belgium.*

Correspondence at: Philip Plaeke, Laboratory of Experimental Medicine and Pediatrics (LEMP), University of Antwerp, Campus Drie Eiken, Building T, T2.27, Universiteitsplein 1, 2610 Wilrijk (Antwerp), Belgium, Phone: 003232652828, Email: philip.plaeke@uantwerpen.be

Background and aims: Arthrofibrosis is a complication of intra-articular knee surgery which is caused by intra-articular fibrosis. To date, several preventive therapies for arthrofibrosis have been reported. This systematic review aims to summarize current knowledge about pharmacological arthrofibrosis prevention. Methods: A systematic literature search was conducted in Medline, Web of Science, and Cochrane library using the search term 'Arthrofibrosis AND prevention'. **Subsequently, articles reporting the effects of a preventive pharmacological intervention against arthrofibrosis were included in this review. Results: 16 studies investigated the pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis of which 13 were conducted in animal models. Several drugs improved the range of motion (ROM) in animal models. Bevacizumab (ROM +39.4 degrees), nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (ROM +18.0-31.2 degrees), and rosiglitazone (ROM +19.5 degrees) significantly increased the ROM. Artesunate, mitomycin c, bevacizumab, hyaloglide, and botulinum toxin A significantly reduced adhesion scores. None of the drugs tested in humans improved the functional outcomes after joint arthroplasty. Methodological differences limited the ability to compare outcomes and, due to poor reporting of methodology, many studies had an unclear risk of bias. Conclusion: This review identified several drugs as potential candidates for arthrofibrosis prevention. These drugs modulate inflammation or alter the activity of fibroblasts. Most studies are conducted in experimental animal models and none of these results are currently translated into a clinical application. Moreover, the methodology and route of administration varied between studies. Nor were dose dependency studies conducted. Future studies should adopt a standardized approach to determine the effects of preventive pharmacological interventions on arthrofibrosis.**

Keywords: Arthrofibrosis, postoperative joint stiffness, intra-articular fibrosis, adhesions.

Abbreviations:

DMSO Dimethyl sulfoxide;

- FC Flexion contracture I
- A Intra-articular route of administration
- PBS Phosphate buffered saline
- ROM Range Of Motion
- TGFβ Transforming Growth Factor Beta
- TKA Total knee arthroplasty
- TNFα Tumor Necrosis Factor Alpha
- VEGF Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor

INTRODUCTION

Arthrofibrosis is a common and invalidating complication of intra-articular knee surgery, most often observed after reconstructive ligament surgery or total knee arthroplasty. Arthrofibrosis is characterized by the formation of intra-articular fibrotic tissue, which causes a reduced range of motion (ROM) and stiffness of the knee, thus dramatically compromising the postoperative function. Knee arthrofibrosis is usually accompanied by pain, loss of strength and the inability to perform normal postoperative levels of physical activity¹.

Arthrofibrosis is the result of a complex interaction between surgery-induced tissue damage, the release of inflammatory mediators by inflammatory cells, and the stimulation of fibroblasts into the production of extracellular matrix². To date, the exact pathophysiology of arthrofibrosis has not been fully elucidated. Current evidence suggests that after an injury or after surgery,

damage to the intra-articular tissues causes hypoxia and the activation of the inflammasome. This causes the recruitment and activation of macrophages, mast cells and T-lymphocytes, which release a large number of inflammatory mediators such as interleukin 1, interleukin 6, tumor necrosis factor α (TNFα), plateletderived growth factor and transforming growth factor beta (TGFβ). This proinflammatory immune activation promotes the recruitment of fibroblasts to the injury site and causes an imbalance between extracellular matrix deposition and degradation. As a result, a dense network of mostly collagen I fibers is constructed with extensive cross-linking between the fibers². This crosslinking prevents efficient apoptosis, autophagy, and matrix degradation by matrix metalloproteinases after the injury-induced inflammation starts to diminish.

Once arthrofibrosis is present, early treatment is advised³. Sometimes physiotherapy, anti-inflammatory drugs, corticosteroids or manipulation under anesthesia can already sufficiently decrease the stiffness of the knee³. If this is insufficient, arthroscopic or open surgical interventions are often necessary, often with moderate functional outcomes⁴. For this reason, preventing arthrofibrosis from developing and maturing is crucial. Many studies have demonstrated that immediate postoperative mobilization and physiotherapy are efficacious in reducing arthrofibrosis^{2,5}. Yet, they are unable to completely prevent it. For this reason, several studies attempted to pharmacologically prevent arthrofibrosis from occurring.

This systematic review aims to summarize current clinical and experimental literature on the pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis and how such treatments could be clinically applied in patients undergoing reconstructive knee surgery.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Search strategy

Between August 2021 and October 2021 a systematic literature search and review was conducted in the databases of Medline, Web of Science and Cochrane Library. To maximize the retrieval of articles that describe the pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis, an inclusive search term without any additional filters was used: 'Arthrofibrosis AND prevention'.

Study Selection

Articles retrieved using the aforementioned search strategy were independently reviewed using a twostage selection method by two reviewers (ER and PP). During the first stage, duplicates were removed and articles were screened based on their title and abstract. Only experimental, prospective or retrospective studies were included at this point. Any type of review, including meta-analyses and systematic reviews, were excluded. Since this systematic review aimed to investigate clinical but also experimental methods in preventing arthrofibrosis, both human and animal studies were included. Furthermore, studies that were not available in English, without a control group, or did not have any type of pharmacological intervention were also excluded in the first stage. When the abstract did not contain sufficient information to decide about inclusion or exclusion, it was carried over to the second selection stage. In this second stage, the remaining studies were assessed based on the contents of their full text. Articles were included if they specifically aimed to prevent arthrofibrosis by pharmacological therapy, if they included a control group and if random group allocation was present. If a study compared pharmacological interventions for arthrofibrosis and both of the reviewers agreed on the inclusion, it was included in the systematic review.

Data extraction

A large heterogeneity between the different studies was already observed during the inclusion process. Therefore a large number of variables and study characteristics were extracted from the different studies. Data extraction included: Type of study, year of publication, the aim of the study, sample size, duration of follow-up, pharmacological properties (type of drug, dose, timing of administration, frequency of administration, method of administration, vehicle), the trigger/method by which arthrofibrosis was induced, the outcomes and how these outcomes were measured.

Data reporting and statistical analysis

Functional outcomes were reported as the range of motion (ROM) or the flexion contracture; the latter defined as the inability to fully extend the joint, both expressed by the number of degrees. Adhesion scores were based on the modified Rothkopf adhesion score (0, no adhesions; 1, filmy, weak fibrous tissues removable by minimal traction/gravity; 2, moderate fibrous tissues separable by manual traction; 3, firm and dense fibrous tissues only surgically removable).

Statistical analysis was performed using Review Manager (Version 5.3, The Cochrane Collaboration, Copenhagen) and R 4.1.1 (R Core Team, 2021; forestplot package $v2.0.1$ ⁶. Adjusted means with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated using a random-effects model. Outcomes of the different studies were graphically displayed as forest plots and categorized based on the type of therapy and weeks after the induction of arthrofibrosis. Due to differences in methodology and treatments, the results of different studies were not pooled except to calculate the differences in ROM/flexion contracture for the control groups.

Quality of the included studies was assessed using SYRCLE's risk of bias tool for animal studies and Cochrane's risk of bias tool for studies in human subjects^{7,8}. Risk of bias was classified as low risk, high risk or unclear risk.

RESULTS

Study selection and overview

Using the search term described above, 187 studies were retrieved (Figure 1). Following the removal of duplicates (n=32) and after screening on title and abstract, 27 studies remained. Additionally, 11 studies were excluded based on the analysis of the full text, mainly because the articles did not have arthrofibrosis as a primary aim or because only *in-vitro* data was reported. As a result, a total of 16 studies were included

Figure 1. – Study inclusion flowchart. Overview of the inclusion process from initial search to the final study selection.

Figure 2. – Risk of bias overview. Risk of bias was assessed using SYRCLE's risk of bias instrument or Cochrane risk-of-bias tool version 2.

in this systematic review⁹⁻²⁴. Quality and risk of bias are reported in Table I and Figure 2.

The majority of studies (n=13) investigated the preventive effect of a pharmacological intervention on arthrofibrosis in an animal model, with only 3 studies reporting clinical outcomes in human subjects. The included studies were subject to significant differences in methodology and a large number of drugs were tested, often in different dosages or in multitherapy (Table II). Furthermore, a large number of techniques to create arthrofibrosis with variable duration of follow-up have been applied throughout the different studies (Table II and supplementary material). In short, animal models for arthrofibrosis typically induced a joint contracture by creating a bony, ligamentous or capsular defect followed by prolonged immobilization of the limb in a flexed position. Studies in humans all reported outcomes following total knee arthroplasty. To determine the effects of the pharmacological intervention, various outcome measures were used. In general, the effects of pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis were reported as the effect on functional outcomes, the macroscopic visualization of intraarticular adhesions, and differences in histology.

Effects on joint mobility

Following surgery and immobilization, vehicle-treated animals had an average adjusted ROM of 52.8 degrees (95% CI 47.7-57.9) after 7-8 weeks, which increased to an average ROM of 66.5 degrees (95% CI 56.2-76.9) after 16-24 weeks. The flexion contracture meanwhile decreased by 22.9 degrees (95% CI 7.1-38.7) within 16-24 weeks.

Three studies tested the effects of a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug for preventing arthrofibrosis (Figure 3)18,20,22. Compared to vehicle-treated rabbits, intra-articular (IA) administration of celecoxib 200-

	Year	Animal/human subjects	Selection bias	Performance bias		Attrition bias	Reporting bias	Other bias			
Arsoy et al. (9)	2018	Animal	$2*$	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Behrend et al. (10)	2019	Human	$+$	$+$	$+$	$\ddot{?}$	$+$	$+$			
Brunelli et al. (11)	2005	Animal	$2*$	$2*$	$+$	$+$	÷	$+$			
Efird et al. (12)	2014	Animal	$2*$	\blacksquare	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Emami et al. (13)	2012	Animal	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	$+$	÷.	$+$			
Emami et al. (14)	2012	Animal	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$\overline{?}$	$2*$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Everts et al. (15)	2012	Human	۰	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	\blacksquare	\blacksquare				
Gao et al. (16)	2017	Animal	$\overline{?}$	$\ddot{?}$	$2*$	$\color{red}+$	$+$	$+$			
Kim et al. (17)	2019	Human	$2*$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Limberg et al. (18)	2020	Animal	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	$\overline{?}$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Namazi et al. (19)	2007	Animal	$2*$	÷,	$2*$	$+$	\blacksquare	$+$			
Salib et al. (20)	2019	Animal	$\ddot{\cdot}$	۰	\blacksquare	\blacksquare	٠	$+$			
Steplewski et al. (21)	2017	Animal	÷	٠	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$+$	$\color{red}+$	$+$			
Tang et al. (22)	2018	Animal	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$2*$	\blacksquare	٠	$+$			
Wan et al. (23)	2019	Animal	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$\ddot{\mathbf{c}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Yan et al. (24)	2010	Animal	$\overline{\mathbf{?}}$	L,	$+$	$+$	$+$	$+$			
Overview of the quality appraisal of the included studies. Experiments conducted in animal models were assessed using SYRCLE's risk of bias instrument ⁷ . The quality of randomized controlled trials in humans was assessed using Cochrane risk-											

Table I. – Overview of the risk of bias assessment

SYRCLE's risk of bias instrument⁷ . The quality of randomized controlled trials in humans was assessed using Cochrane riskof-bias tool version 2^8 . + indicates low risk of bias, ? indicates unclear risk of bias, - indicates high risk of bias. For each type of bias the lowest score is displayed. An asterisk (*) indicates that some of the questions in the bias category were scored as low risk of bias. For a detailed overview of the risk of bias appraisal we refer to supplementary material 1.

400 mg/day increased the ROM by 19.7 degrees (95% CI 5.0-34.4, p=0.009) after 8 weeks and up to 26.0 degrees (95% CI 8.6-43.4, p=0.003) after 24 weeks²⁰. When celecoxib was coated onto a membrane the ROM further increased by 31.2 degrees (95% CI 16.4-46.0, $p<0.001$) compared to the vehicle group¹⁸. Diclofenac IA 0.5 mg improved the ROM by 18 degrees (95% CI 6.5-29.5, p=0.002) after 8 weeks²².

The effects of corticosteroids on joint mobility were only investigated by two studies. Triamcinolone IA 0.68 mg/kg reduced the flexion contracture by 25.0 degrees (95% CI 19.2-30.8, p<0.001) two weeks following surgery (Figure 3). Preventive treatment with dexamethasone IA decreased the flexion contracture by 12.1 degrees (95% CI 0.1-24.1, p=0.048) 8 weeks after open joint surgery.

Treatment with biologicals such as bevacizumab (anti-VEGF, IA) and pegylated anti-alpha2Ct antibody (COL1A antibody, IA) also managed to increase the ROM by 39.4 degrees (95% CI 26.5-52.3, p<0.001) and 11.4 degrees (95% CI 0.2-22.6, p=0.046) respectively13,21. For a complete overview of the preventive effects of the different drugs on the ROM/flexion contracture we refer to Figure 3.

In humans, vitamin C (oral), platelet gel with fibrin sealant (IA), and a temperature-sensitive anti-adhesive poloxamer (IA) were tested^{10,15,17}. None of these drugs affected the long-term ROM after total knee arthroplasty, although the fibrin sealant was able to significantly reduce the incidence of arthrofibrosis.

				FC/	Force		Treadment			Control			Difference		
Study.	Traubises!	Cantrol	Weeks ROM		Nove.	Means	80	Int	Mean	80	P0		in reasons.	98% CI	ja vallan
Arson et al. (2018)	Rosalitazione 1,67 mg	DIMAGE	в	ROM	33	64.4		12	\$3.3		11	-	11.1	35/87	D. DGB
Arson et al. (2018)	Rosigitazone 1.67 ing	DRAID	18	ROM	33	119.0		12	99.5		11	-1	19.5	52338	D.Drick
Erled et al. (2014)	Forskole 1-8 mg/kg	No backrates	÷	FC	15	22.6	11.0	13	32.0	5.0	13	٠	50.0	32.988	0.008
Efected at (2014)	Mantelukast 3.75 mg/kg	Nia traubharen	÷	FC.	15	20.0	ŔĎ.	13	32.0	5.0	13		12.0	67.17.3	-0.001
Efed et al. (2016)	Triamsinatone G-88 regilig	No treatment	ż	FC.	15	7.0	9.D	12	32.0	5.0	12^{1}		25.0	18.2-30.8	<0.001
Entere et al. (2012)	Revasiounab 2.5 mg/kg (1a)	Saline D.Ws	T	ROM	o	65.5	すまま	10	\$8.3	10.6	18	-	7.2	-0.3-17.7	0.190
Entarii et al. (2012)	Bevasiaurus 2.5 mg/kg (2x)	Saline D.PN	x	ROM	o	90.3	18.0	18	\$8.3	10.4	18	--	39.4	28.5-52.3	-0.001
Gas et al. (2017)	Bobulinum taxin A 103U	Saline B.Mi.	ū	ROM	30	98.0	127	13	79.4	10.8	12		論意	87-39.4	0.001
Linbwg et al. (2020)	Celecaviti 1 mg*	No trautment	ŵ	ROM	40	43.6	私店	ű	47.5	9.2	ŭ	-	-3.4	$-12.1 - 4.9$	0.970
Linbwg et al. (2020)	Celecaviti 1 mg*	No trautment	38	ROM	40	111.4	10.2	ú	80.2	11.2	ŭ		31.2	17.8-44.6	0.002
Linberg et al. (2020)	Coleccolo 1 mg + kotolifen 1 mg/kg" Na treatment		ù	ROM	40	\$1.6	13.7	ŭ	47.5	自立	ŭ		4.1	47-16.9	0.950
Linbwg et al. (2025)	Celecoxib 1 mg + ketotifen 1 mg/kg"	No trautment	34	ROM	40	193.0	6.0	a	80.2	13.2	ă		29.8	18.2-41.4	0.003
Linbwg et al. (2020)	ketatilen 1 malka"	IVG SHADTMET	Ė	ROM	40	48.8	$11 - 2$	a	47.5	自立	ă	\sim	2.1	$-0.1 - 13.3$	0.990
Linbwg et al. (2020)	ketotilen 1 molka"	IVo treatment	36	ROM	40	112.0	17.9	ű	80.2	11.2	ŭ		32.4	18.6-45.2	D.DG1
Namudi et al. (2007)	Methylene blue 1%	Saline 6.9%	÷	ROM	Ŭ	91.8	19.2	ű	94.2	2.0	ű		-3.2	$-18.6 - 12.2$	0.689
Nansazi et al. (2007)	Mathylane blue 2%	Saline 6.9%	۰	ROM	Ů	05.7	31.0	a	94.2	2.0	ű		-8.5	$-25.4 - 0.4$	0.334
Salib et al. (2019)	Delecexib 200-460 mg/day	Vehicle	ŵ	ROM	Ů	64.2	15.4	ŭ	44.5	$+0.1$	ű	--	59.7	50-344	0.021
Salb et al. (2019)	Delectivity 200-400 mg/day	Vehicle	34	ROM	Ů	90.2	11.7	ű	64.2	18.4	ă	-	26.0	86434	0.012
Staclowaki et al. (2017)	Anti-alpha2Ct Ab 2 mg/ml	PBS	$+0$	FC	Ŭ	58.2	17.9	14	69.5	15.4	13	- -	54.3	1.0-27.5	0.043
Shaplewaki et al. (2017)	Anti-alpha2D: Ab 2 mg/ml	PBS	34	PO.	Ŭ	45.0	13.0	ä	41.0	13.4	a	. .	3.3	$-12.5 - 10.7$	0.679
Staplewaki et al. (2017)	Peg-anti-alphaGCt Ab 2 mg/mi	PGS	10	PC.	Ŭ	43.0	14.7	v.	49.5	15.4	$+3$	-	20.4	11.7-41.2	0.002
Shaplewaki et al. (2017)	Peg-anti-alpha2Ct.Ab 2 mg/ml	PGS	34	FO	O	32.0	9.O	ű	41.0	13.4	ű	$-$	9.8	$-2.1 - 22.7$	0.156
Tang et al. (2018)	Decorin 100 nM	No treatment	o	PO.	30	36.0	JD	٠	60.6	0.2	٠	سيهد	25.5	15.8-36.1	0.002
Tang et al. (2018)	Decorin 200 nM	No basement	Ø.	FO	20	36.6	6.O	٠	80.6	6.2	٠	--	25.0	13.7-36.2	0.003
LIMING 48 MILL LOUTERS	L/EXB/THRY@SORG 1D IIM	I'via tresservent.	Ð	FU.	23	DO B	0.0	٠	853.63	0.2	٠	m	8.7	40041.4	0.132
Tang et al. (2018)	Desamethasone 1 uN	No treatment	Đ.	FO	30	48.5	9.1	滿	60.6	8.2	ä		52.1	$0.1 - 34.1$	0.040
Tang et al. (2018)	Didofenac B.B5 mg/ml	No treatment	Đ.	FO	30	51.1	72		60.6	8.2	٠		8.5	$-1.2 - 20.2$	0.110
Tang et al. (2018)	Dicioferac 0.5 mg/ml	No treatment	Đ.	FO	30	42.8	Đ.4	٠	60.6	8.2	4	-- m	10.0	6.5-29.5	0.015

Figure 3. – Effects on range of motion (ROM)/flexion contracture (FC). Forest plots indicate the difference in means and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) between the investigated drug and the control group. An asterisk indicates that celecoxib was coated on a resorbable membrane or that a membrane was used as a vehicle. FC, flexion contracture; PBS, phosphate buffered saline; SD, standard deviation; ROM, range of motion.

					Control			Vehicle				Difference		
Study	Treatment	Control	Weeks Mean		80	irò	Mean	80	$\lfloor n \rfloor$			in means	95% CI p-yakat	
Brunelli et al. (2005)	Hyslogide 2 ml	No treatment	7	0.20	0.30	Ð	2.40	0.53	7		$-$	2.20	1.79-2.61	-0.001
	Emami et al. (2012) Bevacizumab 2.5 mg/kg (1x)	Saline 0.9%	7	1.20	0.60	10	2.20	0.60	10		-	1.00	$0.47-1.53 - 00.001$	
	Emami et al. (2012) Bevaoizumeb 2.5 mg/kg (2x)	Saline 0.9%	7	0.20	0.40	10	2.20	0.60	10		--	2.00	1,55-2.45 <0.001	
Empresi et al. (2012)	Enaxipirin 2 mg/kg	Saline 0.9%	12	1.41	0.61	10	1.77	0.73	10			0.36	$-0.23 - 0.95$	0.231
Gao et al. (2017)	Botslinum toein A 100U	Saline 0.9%	a	0.58	0.51	12	2.00	0.73	12		-	1.42	$0.92 - 1.92$	-0.001
Wan et al. (2019)	Artesunate 15 mg/kg	Saline 0.9%	4	1.38.	0,74	16	3.00	0.00	16		-	1.62	1,26-1.98 <0.001	
Wan et al. (2019)	Artesunate 30 mg/kg	Saline 0.9%	4	1.00	0.78	18	3.00	0.00	16		--	2.00	1.83-2.37 <0.001	
Wan et al. (2019)	Artesunate 60 mg/kg	Saline D.9%	4	0.38	0.74	16	3.00	0.00	16		$-$	2.62	2.26-2.98 +0.001	
Yan et al. (2010)	Mitomycin C 0.01 mg/kg	Salne 0.9%	4	2.64	0.55	12	2.83	0.42	12	STATE		0.19	$-0.20 - 0.58$	0.342
Yan et al. (2010)	Mittenwein C 0.06 marka	Saline 0.9%	4	1,48.	0.66	12	2.83	0.42	12		--	1.36	$0.96 - 1.75 - 00.001$	
Yan et al. (2010)	Mitarrypin C 0.1 mg/kg	Saline 0.9%	4	0.32	0.44	12	2.83	0.42	12			2.51	2.17-2.85 <0.001	
										-0.5 ۰ 0.5	1.5 25.3 \rightarrow -1. FWRmenters and this intellectual.			

Figure 4. – Differences in adhesion scores. Forest plots show the difference in means and 95% confidence interval (95% CI) between the investigated drug and the control group for the reported adhesion scores. Higher differences in means indicates a bigger difference, thus lower adhesion scores, between het vehicle and drug-treated group. SD, standard deviation.

Macroscopic adhesion formation

Vehicle-treated animals had an average modified Rothkopf adhesion score of 2.40 (95% CI 1.99-2.81). Adhesion scores tended to decrease if the time after the surgical induction of arthrofibrosis increased ($p=0.053$). A cross-study analysis revealed that differences between animal models resulted in no significant difference in adhesion scores of vehicle-treated animals.

The highest reduction in adhesion scores was seen following treatment with mitomycin C (Chemotherapeutic agent, IA 0.1 mg/kg) and artesunate (antimalarial drug, intragastric 60 mg/kg), showing an absolute mean reduction of 88.7% and 87.3% respectively (Figure 4)23,24. In contrast, mitomycin C dosed at 0.01 mg/kg failed to significantly reduce adhesion scores (Figure $4)$ ²⁴.

Microscopic effects

In animal studies, a dose-dependent effect of bevacizumab was observed, significantly lowering the number of fibroblasts, collagen deposition, vascular proliferation, and amount of inflammatory cells¹³. Furthermore, decreased fibroblast counts were observed on histology following preventive treatment with botulinum toxin A, artesunate, and mitomycin $C^{16,23,24}$

DISCUSSION

Arthrofibrosis has an estimated incidence of around 5% after knee arthroplasty and anterior cruciate ligament repair, but varies between 1-13% in literature^{25,2}. It is therefore frequently encountered in knee surgery. While therapy can frequently improve the function successful, prevention of arthrofibrosis is usually advocated as the best treatment⁴. In recent years, the popularity of arthrofibrosis research has soared, resulting in a threefold increase in the number of published studies in 10 years. This has also led to a growing interest in the pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis. This systematic review summarizes the current literature on pharmacological prevention and/or modulation of arthrofibrosis.

To date, several studies demonstrated a reduced incidence of arthrofibrosis using existing and experimental molecules in a preventive setup. These experimental studies, mostly conducted in animal models, used a large variety of molecules with different mechanisms of action to inhibit the development of arthrofibrosis indicating the involvement of several pathways.

One of the principal requirements for arthrofibrosis is inflammation which upregulates TGFβ and promotes excessive extracellular matrix synthesis by fibroblasts². Our results indicate that preventive strategies that modulate this inflammatory response were superior. In their study, Limberg et al. were able to increase the ROM by over 30% following the intra-articular implantation of a celecoxib-coated membrane in a rabbit model for arthrofibrosis¹⁸. Likewise, intra-articular administrations of celecoxib or diclofenac also showed high efficacy in reducing arthrofibrosis^{20,22}. Reduced arthrofibrosis, although less substantial and hardly dose-dependent, was also observed after administering corticosteroids^{12,22}.

A second group of drugs that exerted a significant preventive effect on arthrofibrosis were the antiproliferative drugs such as bevacizumab and mitomycin $C^{13,24}$. Both drugs increased the ROM after open knee surgery and reduced the macroscopic formation of fibrous adhesions. This is presumably related to the immediate reduction of fibroblastic activity and limiting the maturation of adhesions. Their role in preventing adhesions has already more substantially been reported in peritoneal adhesiogenesis $27-29$.

Another approach to pharmacologically reduce arthro-fibrosis was the direct interference with the collagen formation by blocking the collagen-collagen interaction of collagen I molecules using intraarticular administered recombinant anti-alpha2Ct antibody²¹. Ten weeks after surgery, including 8 weeks of immobilization, a 20% reduction in flexion contracture was seen compared to the vehicle-treated group. By using a pegylated anti-alpha2Ct antibody the effect even increased up to 40%. However, 24 weeks after surgery the effect of anti-alpha2Ct antibodies diminished and its impact on the flexion contracture became indistinguishable from the vehicle-treated $group²¹$.

For other drugs, the mechanism of action is less clear. Artesunate, an antimalarial drug, strongly reduced adhesion scores 23 . It is presumed that artesunate acts on arthrofibrosis by suppressing fibroblast proliferation although the precise mechanism is not fully established³⁰. Similarly, several studies have reported an anti-fibrogenic effect of rosiglitazone, an antidiabetic drug that acts as a PPAR- γ agonist^{31,32}. Indeed a 17.8% increase in ROM was observed 16 weeks after knee joint surgery⁹.

Although this systematic review offers numerous leads for future research, it also shows the lack of standardized, long-term, and translational research. Studies demonstrated important methodological differences and often the methodology was not fully described, resulting in an unclear risk of bias. Although most surgical interventions to create an intra-articular defect were mechanistically similar in most studies, substantial differences remain. Moreover, not a single compound except for Celecoxib was investigated in more than one study. Furthermore, the way arthrofibrosis was defined and diagnosed also differed between studies. The majority of studies reported preventive effects on functional outcomes such as range of motion or joint flexion/extension contracture often against a certain amount of force. However, additional outcomes such as a modified adhesion score, histological investigations and molecular techniques were also often used as indicators for an effect of a drug on arthrofibrosis. This lack of standardization strongly limited the analysis and comparison of

results. Therefore this systematic review is unable to draw strong conclusions on which pharmacological intervention is superior in preventing arthrofibrosis.

Another limitation of the currently available literature is the lack of translational research. Almost none of the presented drugs have been translated into a clinical study. Therefore, it is currently impossible to predict how these compounds would improve clinical outcomes. Similarly, it is unknown how these drugs would result in side effects by affecting wound healing, prosthesis ingrowth or capsular stability.

To further advance in the field of arthrofibrosis prevention we believe that standardizing the methodology of arthrofibrosis research is a priority. Reported outcomes should include the ROM, adhesion severity and occurrence of complications. Moreover, future studies should focus on compounds that directly act on the involved inflammatory or fibrosis pathways, as these compounds proved to be the most effective in our systematic review. Ideally, such a drug is administered directly intra-articular during the procedure and administered in a long-acting gel or resorbable membrane. Finally, after extensive testing in animal models with varying extent of articular damage and varying immobilization a translation to humans should be made.

In conclusion, this systematic review investigated current evidence for the pharmacological prevention of arthrofibrosis. While numerous compounds have been investigated, drugs that acted on the inflammatory pathways or modulated fibroblast proliferation were most efficacious in preventing arthrofibrosis. However, not a single experiment was repeated in an independent study nor translated into a clinical study. Current literature is characterized by considerable differences in experimental models, compounds and techniques to assess the outcomes. Future studies should prioritize a standardized methodological approach.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-forprofit sectors.

Conflict of interest: None of the authors have a conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- 1. Lawrance S, Shelbourne K. Treatment and Rehabilitation of Arthrofibrosis of the Knee. 2011. p. 247-51.
- 2. Usher KM, Zhu S, Mavropalias G, Carrino JA, Zhao J, Xu J. Pathological mechanisms and therapeutic outlooks for arthrofibrosis. Bone Research. 2019;7(1):9.
- 3. Magit D, Wolff A, Sutton K, Medvecky MJ. Arthrofibrosis of the knee. JAAOS-Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. 2007;15(11):682-94.
- 4. Cromheecke M, Missinne M, Van Onsem S, Victor J, Arnout N. Efficacy of total knee arthroplasty (TKA) revision surgery depends upon the indication for revision: a systematic review. Acta Orthop Belg. 2020;86(4):663-677.
- 5. Kumar R, Kaushal K, Kaur S. Role of physiotherapy in postoperative knee stiffness: A literature review. Adesh University Journal of Medical Sciences & Research.2.
- 6. Gordon M LT. Forestplot: Advanced Forest Plot Using 'grid' Graphics. R package version 2.0.1. https://CRAN.R-project. org/package=forestplot. 2021.
- 7. Hooijmans CR, Rovers MM, de Vries RBM, Leenaars M, Ritskes-Hoitinga M, Langendam MW. SYRCLE's risk of bias tool for animal studies. BMC Medical Research Methodology. 2014;14(1):43.
- 8. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2011;343:d5928.
- 9. Arsoy D, Salib CG, Trousdale WH, Tibbo ME, Limberg AK, Viste A, et al. Joint contracture is reduced by intra-articular implantation of rosiglitazone-loaded hydrogels in a rabbit model of arthrofibrosis. J Orthop Res. 2018;36(11):2949-55.
- 10. Behrend H, Lengnick H, Zdravkovic V, Ladurner A, Rudin D, Erschbamer M, et al. Vitamin C demand is increased after total knee arthroplasty: a double-blind placebo-controlledrandomized study. Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy. 2018;27.
- 11. Brunelli G, Longinotti C, Bertazzo C, Pavesio A, Pressato D. Adhesion reduction after knee surgery in a rabbit model by Hyaloglide, a hyaluronan derivative gel. J Orthop Res. 2005;23(6):1377-82.
- 12. Efird W, Kellam P, Yeazell S, Weinhold P, Dahners LE. An evaluation of prophylactic treatments to prevent post traumatic joint stiffness. J Orthop Res. 2014;32(11):1520-4.
- 13. Emami MJ, Jaberi FM, Azarpira N, Vosoughi AR, Tanideh N. Prevention of arthrofibrosis by monoclonal antibody against vascular endothelial growth factor: a novel use of bevacizumab in rabbits. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res. 2012;98(7):759-64.
- 14. Emami MJ, Namazi H, Vosoughi AR, Nezhad ST, Oryan A, Mozaffarian K. Can enoxaparin prevent arthrofibrosis? Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther. 2012;50(1):49-50.
- 15. Everts PA, Devilee RJ, Oosterbos CJ, Mahoney CB, Schattenkerk ME, Knape JT, et al. Autologous platelet gel and fibrin sealant enhance the efficacy of total knee arthroplasty: improved range of motion, decreased length of stay and a reduced incidence of arthrofibrosis. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2007;15(7):888-94.
- 16. Gao Z-Y, Wu J-X, Liu W-B, Sun J-K. Reduction of adhesion formation after knee surgery in a rat model by botulinum toxin A. Biosci Rep. 2017;37(2):BSR20160460.
- 17. Kim JK, Park JY, Lee DW, Ro DH, Lee MC, Han HS. Temperature-sensitive anti-adhesive poloxamer hydrogel decreases fascial adhesion in total knee arthroplasty: A prospective randomized controlled study. J Biomater Appl. 2019;34(3):386-95.
- 18. Limberg AK, Tibbo ME, Salib CG, McLaury AR, Turner TW, Berry CE, et al. Reduction of arthrofibrosis utilizing a collagen membrane drug-eluting scaffold with celecoxib and subcutaneous injections with ketotifen. J Orthop Res. 2020;38(11):2474-83.
- 19. Namazi H, Emami M, Dehghani Nazhvani F, Dehghani Nazhvani A, Kargarshouroki Z. Effectiveness of Methylene Blue in the Prevention of Stifle Joint Arthrofibrosis in Rabbit Models. Archives of Bone and Joint Surgery. 2019;7.
- 20. Salib CG, Reina N, Trousdale WH, Limberg AK, Tibbo ME, Jay AG, et al. Inhibition of COX-2 Pathway as a Potential

Prophylaxis Against Arthrofibrogenesis in a Rabbit Model of Joint Contracture. J Orthop Res. 2019;37(12):2609-20.

- 21. Steplewski A, Fertala J, Beredjiklian PK, Abboud JA, Wang MLY, Namdari S, et al. Blocking collagen fibril formation in injured knees reduces flexion contracture in a rabbit model. J Orthop Res. 2017;35(5):1038-46.
- 22. Tang X, Teng S, Petri M, Krettek C, Liu C, Jagodzinski M. The effect of anti-inflammatory and antifibrotic agents on fibroblasts obtained from arthrofibrotic tissue: An in vitro and in vivo study. Bone Joint Res. 2018;7(3):213-22.
- 23. Wan Q, Chen H, Xiong G, Jiao R, Liu Y, Li X, et al. Artesunate protects against surgery-induced knee arthrofibrosis by activating Beclin-1-mediated autophagy via inhibition of mTOR signaling. Eur J Pharmacol. 2019;854:149-58.
- 24. Yan L, Sun Y, Wang J, Dai S, Feng X, Jiang B, et al. The effect of mitomycin C in reducing intraarticular adhesion after knee surgery in rabbits. Eur J Pharmacol. 2010;643(1):1-5.
- 25. Ipach I, Mittag F, Lahrmann J, Kunze B, Kluba T. Arthrofibrosis after TKA – Influence factors on the absolute flexion and gain in flexion after manipulation under anaesthesia. BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders. 2011;12(1):184.
- 26. Willimon SC, Perkins CA. 40 Postoperative Management. In: LaPrade RF, Chahla J, editors. Evidence-Based Management of Complex Knee Injuries. Philadelphia: Elsevier; 2022. p. 449- 54.
- 27. Ignjatovic D, Aasland K, Pettersen M, Sund S, Chen Y, Spasojevic M, et al. Intra-abdominal administration of bevacizumab diminishes intra-peritoneal adhesions. The American Journal of Surgery. 2010;200(2):270-5.
- 28. Karanlik H, Kurt A, Kunduz E, Serin K, Saglam S, Soydinc HO, et al. Effects of Intraperitoneal Bevacizumab Administration on Colonic Anastomosis and Early Postoperative Adhesion Formation. Surgical Innovation. 2013;20(6):559-65.
- 29. Cubukçu A, Alponat A, Gönüllü NN. Mitomycin-C prevents reformation of intra-abdominal adhesions after adhesiolysis. Surgery. 2002;131(1):81-4.
- 30. Chen H, Tao J, Wang J, Yan L. Artesunate prevents knee intraarticular adhesion via PRKR-like ER kinase (PERK) signal pathway. Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery and Research. 2019;14(1):448.
- 31. Demirturk F, Aytan H, Caliskan A, Aytan P, Yener T, Koseoglu D, et al. The effect of rosiglitazone in the prevention of intraabdominal adhesion formation in a rat uterine horn model. Hum Reprod. 2006;21(11):3008-13.
- 32. Liu Y, Dai B, Xu C, Fu L, Hua Z, Mei C. Rosiglitazone inhibits transforming growth factor-β1 mediated fibrogenesis in ADPKD cyst-lining epithelial cells. PLoS One. 2011;6(12):e28915-e.