ROBOTIC OVERREACH vs THE PRECISION PROMISE: THE LEGAL QUAGMIRE OF HIGH-TECH JOINT REPLACEMENTS

By orthopaedic consultant and expert witness
Professor Paul Lee

THE MARCH OF INNOVATION in orthopaedic surgery has introduced robotic-assisted procedures as a hallmark of modern knee and hip replacements. Promising unmatched precision, these technological marvels, however, present a paradox: they bring forth novel complications and elongated surgery times without clear evidence of long-term advantages.

Insights from journals such as *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* and *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* cast a shadow of doubt, revealing increased risks without substantial improvements. That dichotomy ushers in a pivotal legal enquiry: when complications emerge, who bears responsibility?

Legal foundations: breach of duty and causation

The cornerstone of a medical negligence claim rests on proving a breach of duty and establishing causation. The complexity of applying those legal principles intensifies with robotic surgery. Does the adoption of a cutting-edge yet potentially riskier approach constitute a breach of duty, especially amid contested benefits?

Recent evaluations – notably the American Joint Replacement Registry's 2017-2020 analysis, published in *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* – scrutinise the effectiveness of robotic-assisted total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Out of 142,550 TKAs, 14,216 employed robotics, revealing no discernible improvement in revision rates. That finding marks a critical juncture, indicating that technological precision does not necessarily correlate with better surgical outcomes.

The issue of pin-site complications in robotic-assisted TKA, with a reported rate of 4.1%, underlines a significant risk to patient well-being. Such a high incidence, highlighted in the *Journal of Experimental Orthopaedics* in 2023, raises a fundamental question: does introducing robotic technology – and its inherent risks – constitute a breach of healthcare providers' duty?

Legal standards require demonstrating that this breach directly resulted in harm, blurring the lines in the context of robotic TKA. That scenario necessitates a thorough legal and ethical examination of the outcomes associated with robotic intervention.

Informed consent and ethical considerations

The crux of informed consent is ensuring that patients are fully apprised of the risks and benefits of their surgical options. The lack of substantial benefits from robotic-assisted TKA, juxtaposed with increased pin-site complications and increased surgical time risks, underlines the need for a transparent consent process. That approach should reflect an accurate understanding of robotic surgery's implications, allowing patients to make decisions based on evidence rather than the allure of innovation.

Healthcare providers must carefully weigh the promotion of technological advances against the imperative to fully inform patients about potential new complications and the absence of proven long-term benefits.

Robotic precision: a legal dilemma

The exactitude promised by robotic assistance might inadvertently result in 'precisely wrong' outcomes, given its reliance on non-weight-bearing scans for planning. That discrepancy poses significant legal questions about informed consent and the surgeon's understanding of the robotic system's planning, accentuated by the Montgomery ruling's emphasis on material risks and alternatives.

Causation: disentangling technology from outcome

Determining causation in robotic surgery complications requires a meticulous analysis to discern whether adverse outcomes were directly attributable to robotic technology or other factors. That legal principle is entangled with medical complexities, necessitating a nuanced understanding of both technology and patient-specific considerations.

Looking ahead with caution

As we delve deeper into the era of medical innovation, the implications of adopting robotic-assisted surgery for joint replacements call for a reassessment of standard practices. The legal and medical fields must collaborate to ensure that the quest for precision does not compromise patient welfare and informed decision-making.

The question looms: are we ready to tackle the legal and ethical challenges that accompany technological advancements in surgery? ❑