

---

Department of Radiology Faculty Papers

Department of Radiology

---

11-30-2020

## AUTHOR REPLY.

Selin Isguven  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Paul H. Chung  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Priscilla Machado  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Lauren J. Delaney  
*Thomas Jefferson University*

Antonia F. Chen  
*Brigham & Women's Hospital*

See next page for additional authors.  
Follow this and additional works at: <https://jdc.jefferson.edu/radiologyfp>



Part of the [Radiology Commons](#), and the [Urology Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you**

---

### Recommended Citation

Isguven, Selin; Chung, Paul H.; Machado, Priscilla; Delaney, Lauren J.; Chen, Antonia F.; Forsberg, Flemming; and Hickok, Noreen J., "AUTHOR REPLY." (2020). *Department of Radiology Faculty Papers*. Paper 104.

<https://jdc.jefferson.edu/radiologyfp/104>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Jefferson Digital Commons. The Jefferson Digital Commons is a service of Thomas Jefferson University's [Center for Teaching and Learning \(CTL\)](#). The Commons is a showcase for Jefferson books and journals, peer-reviewed scholarly publications, unique historical collections from the University archives, and teaching tools. The Jefferson Digital Commons allows researchers and interested readers anywhere in the world to learn about and keep up to date with Jefferson scholarship. This article has been accepted for inclusion in Department of Radiology Faculty Papers by an authorized administrator of the Jefferson Digital Commons. For more information, please contact: [JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu](mailto:JeffersonDigitalCommons@jefferson.edu).

---

**Authors**

Selin Isguven, Paul H. Chung, Priscilla Machado, Lauren J. Delaney, Antonia F. Chen, Flemming Forsberg, and Noreen J. Hickok

Paul H. Chung<sup>1</sup>, Selin Isguven<sup>2,3</sup>, Priscilla Machado<sup>3</sup>, Lauren J Delaney<sup>3</sup>,  
Antonia F. Chen<sup>4</sup>, Flemming Forsberg<sup>3</sup>, Noreen J. Hickok<sup>2</sup>

Department of Urology<sup>1</sup>, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery<sup>2</sup>, Department of  
Radiology<sup>3</sup>, Thomas Jefferson University Philadelphia, PA <sup>4</sup>Department of Orthopaedic  
Surgery, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Boston, MA

Since the introduction of the inflatable penile implant in 1973, the only device advancements to reduce infection have been the addition of an antibiotic coating in 2001 and a hydrophilic coating in 2002.<sup>1-3</sup> These coatings elute antibiotics into the surgical space for 48 hours; however, any remaining, viable biofilm-forming bacteria are then able to colonize the implant. These coatings have helped to decrease, but not eliminate, the risk for clinical infection and device malfunction. Therefore, it was our goal in this review to provide all potential avenues to decrease infection based on the vast experience of orthopaedic surgery.

Integrating antibiotic coatings for orthopaedic joint prostheses is perhaps a greater technical challenge than penile implants. Joint prostheses need to accommodate several different environments (soft tissue, bone, and synovial fluid) while also meeting mechanical/surface requirements (weight bearing, fixation, insertion, osseointegration, and durability). Joint prostheses may also be comprised of several materials (stainless steel, titanium, chrome, cobalt, or polyethylene) and interchangeable parts. Combined with abrasive mechanical insertion and possible use of cements, it is understandable how an antibiotic coating for joint prostheses is no trivial task.

For both specialties, it is vital that novel methods are developed to mitigate the damaging physical and psychosocial consequences of implant infection. Several general approaches exist to reduce infection including application of pharmacologically active agents (i.e. antibiotics, antiseptics, or other organic/inorganic substances), surface chemistry or structure modifications, and perioperative antibacterial local carriers that applied during surgery and not directly part of the device. Due to the significant effort required to obtain Federal Drug and Administration approval for new drug/device combinations in penile implants, the latter approaches may be the most ideal pathways for new development.

1. Scott FB, Bradley WE, Timm GW. Management of erectile impotence. Use of implantable inflatable prosthesis. *Urology*. 1973;2(1):80-2. Epub 1973/07/01. doi: 10.1016/0090-4295(73)90224-0.
2. Wolter CE, Hellstrom WJ. The hydrophilic-coated inflatable penile prosthesis: 1-year experience. *J Sex Med*. 2004;1(2):221-4. Epub 2006/01/25. doi: 10.1111/j.1743-6109.2004.04032.x.
3. Carson CC, 3rd. Efficacy of antibiotic impregnation of inflatable penile prostheses in decreasing infection in original implants. *J Urol*. 2004;171(4):1611-4. Epub 2004/03/17. doi: 10.1097/01.ju.0000118245.66976.e1.