

Why a Partial Knee?

There are clinically proven health economic benefits for knee arthroplasty, in particular Partial Knee Arthroplasty (PKA) in comparison to total knee arthroplasty (TKA). PKA is a cost effective,¹⁻⁴ proven solution^{5,6} for uni-compartmental osteoarthritis.

POTENTIAL COST SAVINGS VS. TKA

18%↓

On average lower procedural cost savings⁸⁻¹¹

One study found **fewer patients** require rehabilitation and physiotherapy (PKA \$450 vs TKA \$2,455)¹²



Shorter Hospital Stays^{8-12, 14}

TKA: 2.2^{14*}



PKA: 1.4^{14*}

*Average length of stay in days annually in one study

According to Kazarian *et al*,
“PKA should be chosen over TKA in order to maximize cost-effectiveness.”⁷



Substantial cost savings of approximately \$3,261 per knee, and \$105 million annually found in one UK study¹



Cost-effective treatment at all ages and the incremental benefit increased with age^{15, 16}

REDUCED RISK OF COMPLICATION vs. TKA

Type of Complication	TKA	PKA
Overall Risk of post-operative complications ¹⁰	11%	4.3%
Risk of transfusion ⁴	11%	0%
90-day rates of readmission ^{10**}	4.2%	2.7%

**Not statistically significant

BENEFITS TO SOCIETY vs. TKA

One study found PKA has an estimated **lifetime societal savings** \$987 million to \$1.5 billion every year.⁶



Total lifetime societal savings for PKA in 2015 are predicted to increase according to Shankar *et al*⁷

Kievit *et al* found PKA patients returned to work within 3 months¹⁸

73% PKA
vs.
48% TKA

PKA had lower total surgical costs according to one study⁴

PKA	TKA
\$11,397	\$16,243

References

1. Willis-Owen CA, et al. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in the UK National Health Service: An analysis of candidacy, outcome and cost efficacy. *Knee*. 2009 Dec;16(6):473–8. Publication was performed from a UK perspective, for illustration purposes results have been converted to US\$ using an average US\$ to UK pound conversion rate as at 2008 (<http://www.x-rates.com/average>).
2. Slover J, et al. Cost-effectiveness of unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty in elderly low-demand patients. A Markov decision analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2006 Nov;88(11):2348–55.
3. SooHoo NF, et al. Cost-effectiveness analysis of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty as an alternative to total knee arthroplasty for unicompartmental osteoarthritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2006 Sep;88(9):1975–82.
4. Shankar S., Tetreault M. W., Jegier B. J., Andersson G. B., Della Valle C. J.. A cost comparison of unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty. *The Knee*. 2016; 23 (6): 1016-1019.
5. Price AJ, Svard U. A second decade lifetable survival analysis of the Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2011 Jan;469(1):174-9.
6. Pandit et al. The clinical outcome of minimally invasive phase 3 Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J* 2015;97-B:1493–1500.
7. Kazarian G. S., Lonner J. H., Maltenfort M. G., Ghomrawi, H. M.K., Chen A. F. Cost-Effectiveness of Surgical and Nonsurgical Treatments for Unicompartmental Knee Arthritis: A Markov Model. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Oct 2018; 100(19):1653–1660.
8. Robertsson O, Borgquist L, Knutson K, Lewold S, Lidgren L. Use of unicompartmental instead of tricompartmental prostheses for unicompartmental arthrosis in the knee is a cost-effective alternative. 15,437 primary tricompartmental prostheses were compared with 10,624 primary medial or lateral unicompartmental prostheses. *Acta Orthop Scand*. 1999;70(2):170-5.
9. Shakespeare D, Jeffcote B. Unicompartmental arthroplasty of the knee—cheap at half the price? *The Knee*. 2003;10:357-61.
10. Brown NM, et al. Total knee arthroplasty has higher postoperative morbidity than unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: A multicenter analysis. *J Arthroplasty*. Epub ahead of print. 2012 May 4.
11. Xie F, Lo NN, Tarride JE, O'Reilly D, Goeree R, Lee HP. Total or partial knee replacement? Cost-utility analysis in patients with knee osteoarthritis based on a 2-year observational study. *Eur J Health Econ*. 10 April 2009.
12. Peersman, G. et al. Cost-effectiveness of unicompartmental versus total knee arthroplasty: a Markov model analysis. *The Knee* 21 S1 (2014) S37–S42. Publication was performed from a Belgian healthcare payer perspective, for illustration purposes results have been converted to US\$ using an average US\$ to Euro€ conversion rate as at 2014 (<http://www.x-rates.com/average>).
13. Beard DJ., Davies LJ., Cook JA., MacLennan G., Price A., Kent S., Hudson J., Carr A., Leal J., Campbell H., Fitzpatrick R., Arden N., Murray D., Campbell MK., for the TOPKAT Study Group. The clinical and cost-effectiveness of total versus partial knee replacement in patients with medial compartment osteoarthritis (TOPKAT): 5-year outcomes of a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Journal*. August 31; 394 (10200): 746-756.
14. Lombardi AV Jr, Berend KR, Walter CA, Aziz-Jacobo J, Cheney NA. Is recovery faster for mobile-bearing unicompartmental than total knee arthroplasty? *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2009 Jun;467(6):1450-1457.
15. Burn E., et al. Cost-effectiveness of unicompartmental compared with total knee replacement: a population-based study using data from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *BMJ Open*;8:e020977..1136/bmjopen-2017-020977
16. Burn E., Liddle AD., Hamilton TW., Pai S., Pandit HG., Murray DW., Pinedo-Villanueva R. Choosing Between Unicompartmental and Total Knee Replacement: What Can Economic Evaluations Tell Us? A Systematic Review. *Sys Rev*. December 2017; 1(4): 241–253.
17. Ghomrawi, H. et al. Effect of Age on Cost-Effectiveness of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty Compared with Total Knee Arthroplasty in the U.S. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2015;97:396-402.
18. Kievit, A. et al. A return to work sooner after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty than after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy*. 2019 Aug 30. doi: 10.1007/s00167-019-05667-0. [Epub ahead of print]

In the United States (US), the Oxford Partial Knee is intended for use in individuals with osteoarthritis or avascular necrosis limited to the medial compartment of the knee and is intended to be implanted with bone cement; it is not indicated for use in the lateral compartment or for patients with ligament deficiency. Potential risks include, but are not limited to, loosening, dislocation, fracture, wear, and infection, any of which can require additional surgery. For complete prescribing information, see the package insert and www.zimmerbiomet.com.

This material is intended for health care professionals and the Zimmer Biomet sales force. Distribution to any other recipient is prohibited.

Zimmer Biomet does not practice medicine. The treating surgeon is responsible for determining the appropriate treatment, technique(s), and product(s) for each individual patient.

©2020 Zimmer Biomet



ZIMMER BIOMET
Your progress. Our promise.®