

ROSA[®] Partial Knee

VALUE ANALYSIS BRIEF Clinical and Economic Value of the ROSA Partial Knee System



Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	2
2. Clinical Burden (PKA vs TKA).....	4
2.1 Economic burden (PKA vs TKA)	12
2.2 Evolution of PKA Treatment Landscape	15
3. ROSA Partial Knee System.....	19
4. Evidence of Partial Knee Robotic Systems	21
5. How ROSA Partial Knee Differs from Other Robotics Systems	24
5.1 ROSA Partial Knee Return on Investment	24
6. References.....	25

1. Executive Summary

Knee osteoarthritis (OA) is a progressive disease, and it is projected that approximately half of all patients will eventually undergo a total knee arthroplasty (TKA).¹ However, for a well-defined subset of patients with anteromedial OA,^{2,3} partial knee arthroplasty (PKA) offers **a less invasive alternative to TKA**.

- PKA preserves bone stock and natural ligaments,⁴ allowing for normal knee kinematics (stability, balance) and improved physiological function vs TKA.⁵⁻⁷
- In comparative studies, PKA has demonstrated better functional outcomes,⁸⁻¹¹ faster recovery time,⁹⁻¹² higher patient satisfaction,¹³⁻¹⁵ and fewer complications than TKA.¹⁶⁻¹⁹
- Patients have reported less pain^{10,14} and, consequently, less opioid use with PKA vs TKA.²⁰⁻²²
- Results from randomized clinical trials have also favored PKA over TKA.^{8,23,24}

Although prospective and retrospective studies have shown that **nearly 50% of all knee replacement patients could be candidates for PKA**,^{3,25,26} PKA currently accounts for less than 8% of joint arthroplasty procedures in the US.²⁷⁻²⁹ Surgical volume is a critical factor in optimizing outcomes, with 20% of PKA utilization established as the minimum threshold for significantly decreasing revision rates in a large registry study.³⁰

US-based economic evaluations have demonstrated the cost-effectiveness of PKA, which is associated with **lower hospital direct costs and total costs vs TKA**,³¹⁻³⁵ as well as shorter hospital stays and decreased risk of discharge to a rehabilitation facility.^{11,18,31} The shorter procedure times and reduced instrumentation associated with PKA can also promote efficiency in the OR.^{31,36,37}

As the treatment landscape for knee arthroplasty evolves, key considerations will include care team well-being and retention,³⁸⁻⁴¹ particularly in the context of higher patient volume and cost containment pressures,⁴²⁻⁴⁵ and the ongoing adoption of robotic technology.⁴⁶ PKA is well-suited to robotic assistance, and utilization of robotic-assisted PKA has increased at more than double the rate of unassisted PKA.^{46,47} In a survey study, patients expressed a preference for robotic-assisted orthopedic surgery, suggesting a potential marketing pull for hospitals and surgery centers.⁴⁸

The **ROSA Partial Knee system** is a surgeon-centered robotic platform for enhancing the accuracy, precision, and efficiency of PKA procedures.⁴⁹ The ROSA Partial Knee system:

- Collects real-time data on patient's anatomy and soft tissues to provide dynamic tracking, laxity and tissue balance support, and solid resection construction⁴⁹
- Provides a simple and easy-to-use workflow that can adapt to surgeons' individual preferences, building confidence and minimizing the learning curve⁴⁹
- Works with the Persona[®] Partial Knee implant, a fixed bearing knee replacement built upon the clinical heritage of the Miller Galante (M/G) unicompartmental knee system, and Vivacit-E[®] vitamin E highly crosslinked polyethylene for enhanced strength and ultra-low wear⁵⁰
- Integrates with the OrthoIntel Orthopedic Intelligence Platform and mymobility[®] with Apple Watch[®] to enhance pre- and post-operative communication and monitoring.⁴⁹

Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section

Partial knee robotics systems have been shown to increase surgical accuracy and decrease outliers vs conventional methods, promoting a decrease in revision surgeries and improved implant survivorship.⁵¹⁻⁵⁵ Robotic PKA has been associated with very high patient satisfaction, rapid return to sports, and functional and quality of life outcomes that are improved or comparable to conventional PKA.⁵⁵⁻⁵⁸

The features of the ROSA Partial Knee system offer unique advantages compared to some other robotic PKA systems:

- X-Atlas™ 2D to 3D process, which generates 3D image-based surgical plans using X-ray imaging instead of CT scans^{49,59}
- Flexibility for surgeons' preferred methods (no robot-specific representative needed)⁴⁹
- Real-time soft tissue balancing allows surgeons to adjust component rotation based on ligament tension, taking into account the full range of motion for the knee⁶⁰
- Single robotic platform for knee arthroplasty, with a simple intraoperative transition from PKA to TKA if needed^{49,61}

**Patients must have a compatible smartphone and be clinically evaluated as appropriate candidates for remote care to use mymobility

††ROSA Partial Knee has not been clinically evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies cited in this section

2. Clinical Burden (PKA vs TKA)[†]

Key Takeaways:

- ✓ For a well-defined subset of patients with unicompartmental OA,^{2,3} PKA offers a less invasive alternative to TKA; in comparative studies, PKA has demonstrated better functional outcomes,⁸⁻¹¹ faster recovery time,⁹⁻¹² and higher patient satisfaction^{13,14}
- ✓ Patients who received a PKA have reported less post-operative pain,^{10,14} and consequently less opioid use, compared with TKA²⁰⁻²²
- ✓ PKA procedures have been associated with significantly fewer complications in head-to-head studies vs TKA, including lower rates of deep infection, venous thromboembolic events, and myocardial infarction¹⁶⁻¹⁹
- ✓ Nearly 50% of all knee replacement patients could be candidates for PKA,^{25,26} however, PKA accounts for less than 8% of joint arthroplasty procedures in the US²⁷⁻²⁹
- ✓ Approximately half of patients in one peer-reviewed survey study expressed a preference for PKA over TKA⁶²
- ✓ Surgical volume is a critical factor in optimizing PKA outcomes, with 20% PKA utilization established as the minimum threshold for significantly decreasing revision rates in a large registry study³⁰

Osteoarthritis (OA) is the most common form of arthritis and a leading cause of disability in the US.^{63,64}

- Approximately 15 million Americans are affected by symptomatic OA of the knee, including nearly 9 million with advanced knee OA⁶⁵
- The overall prevalence of OA in the US is increasing, and this trend is expected to continue given aging and obesity projections⁶⁶
- The prevalence of knee OA increases with age, and the cumulative risk of developing symptomatic knee OA by the age of 60 is 9.3%;⁶⁷ however, working age adults (18 to 64 years) account for over half of all patients with OA in the US⁶⁸

Knee OA is a progressive disease, and it is projected that **approximately half of all patients will eventually undergo a total knee arthroplasty (TKA).**¹

- TKA utilization increased dramatically in the US between 1999 and 2008, with TKA utilization more than doubling among the overall population and tripling among individuals age 45 to 64⁶⁹
- In 2017, more than 754,000 TKA procedures were performed in the US;⁷⁰ by 2025, this number is predicted to rise to 1.27 million⁷¹

However, for a well-defined subset of patients,⁷² partial knee arthroplasty (PKA) offers a less invasive alternative that has demonstrated better functional outcomes⁸⁻¹¹ and fewer complications.¹⁶⁻¹⁹

[†]Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section

Optimal Indication

Knee OA confined to a single compartment (medial, lateral, or patellofemoral) is termed unicompartmental osteoarthritis of the knee.^{4,73} For patients with isolated medial knee OA, unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (UKA; also termed partial knee arthroplasty, or PKA) offers an attractive alternative to TKA.⁷²

- PKA preserves bone stock and natural ligaments,⁴ allowing for normal knee kinematics (stability, balance) and improved physiological function vs TKA;^{5-7,74,75} in a head-to-head gait comparison study (n=12 TKA; n=12 PKA; n=121 healthy controls), PKA was associated with a higher top walking speed and a more physiological gait than TKA⁷
- PKA has been associated with fewer complications than TKA in comparative studies, including lower rates of deep infection, venous thromboembolic events, and myocardial infarction^{16,18,76}

Patient selection is key to a successful PKA; Per Berend et al 2015, the consensus patient selection criteria is Anteromedial Osteoarthritis (AMOA; OA limited to the medial compartment).^{2,3,77,78}

- AMOA is defined as: bone-on-bone in the medial compartment, full-thickness cartilage in the lateral compartment, functionally intact anterior cruciate ligament (ACL), and functionally normal medial collateral ligament (MCL)^{2,3}
- An additional rare indication for PKA is spontaneous osteonecrosis of the knee (SONK)⁷⁷

For a well-defined subset of patients with anteromedial OA, PKA offers a less invasive alternative to TKA

Improved Outcomes

PKA has been associated with better function, more natural motion, and a faster recovery time compared with TKA.

- A review of joint registry data (n=3,519 PKA; n=10,557 TKA) demonstrated that 59% more PKA patients achieved excellent results than TKA patients¹⁴
- Better range of motion has been observed with PKA vs TKA in comparative studies^{9,11,12}
 - Significantly better range of motion ($p=0.0016$) was observed 6 weeks following PKA vs TKA in a retrospective matched cohort study (n=103 mobile-bearing PKA; n=103 TKA)¹¹
- PKA has produced more physiological functionality and more natural motion, with a near-normal gait^{5-7,75}
 - In a head-to-head gait comparison study (n=12 TKA; n=12 PKA; n=121 healthy controls), PKA was associated with a higher top walking speed and a more physiological gait than TKA⁷
 - Patients with both a PKA and a TKA (N=16) favored the PKA side in treadmill gait analysis⁶
- Additional advantages of PKA include a faster recovery time⁹⁻¹² and more likely return to low-impact sports^{10-12,79,80}
 - In a retrospective case-control study (n=35 PKA; n=35 TKA), patients who received a PKA reported significantly higher post-operative activity level than those who received a TKA ($p<0.001$)⁸⁰

Results from **randomized clinical trials have favored PKA** over TKA.

- Results from a large randomized clinical trial using surgeon's choice of implant (TOPKAT; N=528) demonstrated that PKA and TKA produced comparable clinical outcomes, but PKA was more effective, providing 0.240 additional quality-adjusted life-years (QALYs) over 5 years of follow up. Based on the results of this study, the authors suggest that PKA should be considered the first choice for patients with late-stage isolated medial OA.²³
- A single-center randomized trial (N=102) assessed results over a longer follow-up period, with fixed-bearing PKA recipients demonstrating better patient-reported outcomes and implant survivorship vs TKA at 15 years.⁸
- Another single-center randomized trial (N=80) in patients with early medial OA reported similar improvement in patient-reported outcomes, function, and performance at 2 years, but fewer complications in the fixed-bearing PKA group vs the TKA group.²⁴

Patients who received a PKA have reported less pain^{10,14} and, consequently, less opioid use.²⁰⁻²²

- A US retrospective study reported that patients who underwent PKA were less significantly likely to require a second opioid prescription (50.2% vs 60.5%; $p=0.0006$), and significantly less likely to report continued opioid use, as defined by >5 prescriptions (5.8% vs 13.7%; $p=0.001$)²⁰
- Another US claims database study found that PKA patients had significantly lower rates of post-operative opioid prescription compared to TKA patients over 1 year of follow-up, with pre-operative opioid use the strongest predictor of prolonged post-opioid use⁸¹
- In opioid-naïve patients, PKA was associated with less opioid consumption, lower refill rates, and shorter duration of use over the 4-week post-operative period vs TKA²¹
- When pre-operative opioid use was balanced across comparator arms, in a network cohort study designed to emulate the TOPKAT trial, a 35% to 40% cumulative incidence of opioid use was observed in the 3 to 12 months following PKA, compared to 40% to 45% following TKA²²

PKA has been associated with less post-operative pain and opioid use vs TKA

Although PKA is frequently associated with higher revision rates than TKA in registry and observational studies,^{16,76} the only large randomized trial conducted to date found no difference in revision rates between PKA and TKA.²³

- In the TOPKAT RCT, which randomized patients with isolated medial knee OA to either PKA or TKA (surgeon's choice of implant), revision rates at 5 years of follow-up were 4% in both groups, with 6% of the PKA group and 8% of the TKA group receiving any re-operation²³
 - Revisions were predominantly due to unexplained pain (2 patients receiving PKA vs 5 patients receiving TKA) or bearing dislocation (3 patients vs 0 patients, respectively)
- Long-term follow-up with the Oxford® mobile-bearing PKA implant has demonstrated survivorship ranging from 92.4% at 10 years⁸²⁻⁸⁷ to 91.0% at 20 years⁸⁸
- Replacement of an unsuccessful TKA with another TKA is a major reconstruction of the joint, often requiring specific revision implants; thus, surgeons may be less willing to advise re-operation of a TKA than a PKA^{16,89}
 - PKA, being less invasive, can typically be converted to TKA with standard primary components
- American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) 2015 guidelines for surgical management of knee OA support the use of TKA over PKA to decrease revision risk, but note the need for a large prospective randomized trial⁹⁰
 - Following publication of data from the TOPKAT trial, the UK National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) released an updated guideline recommending that patients with medial compartment OA be offered a choice of PKA or TKA, based on the relative risks and benefits for each patient^{91,92}

Across studies, PKA has been associated with a **reduced rate of complications** compared to TKA, even after adjusting for differences in patient populations.

- AAOS guidelines note that limited evidence supports use of PKA vs TKA to decrease the risk of deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and manipulation under anesthesia for medial compartment OA⁹⁰
- A systematic review identified a significantly increased risk of venous thromboembolic events (risk ratio 0.39; 95% CI 0.27, 0.57; $p < 0.001$) and major cardiac events (risk ratio 0.22; 95% CI 0.06, 0.86; $p = 0.03$) with TKA vs PKA in registry and large database studies⁷⁶
- A US retrospective database review (N=828) reported a low rate of 90-day perioperative complications, with no post-operative variances from normal recovery in 88% of patients⁹³
- Higher post-operative morbidity with TKA was also reported in a US retrospective multicenter study (n=2,235 TKA, n=605 PKA): after adjusting for demographic differences, PKA patients had a significantly lower overall risk of complications vs TKA patients (4.3% vs 11.0%; odds ratio 2.8; $p < 0.0001$), as well as stiffness requiring manipulation under anesthesia (0.4% vs 5.0%; odds ratio 13.0; $p < 0.0001$) and post-operative transfusion (0.2% vs 1.6%; odds ratio 8.5; $p = 0.036$)¹⁸
- Based on data from the National Joint Registry of England and Wales (NJR; N=341,749 knee arthroplasty procedures) using propensity score matching to minimize confounding by indication, patients in the PKA group experienced significantly lower rates of intraoperative complications, blood transfusion, thromboembolism, stroke, and myocardial infarction, relative to the TKA group ($p < 0.02$ for all), and significantly lower rates of reoperation for infection ($p < 0.0001$)¹⁶
- A Swedish registry study (n=15,437 TKA; n=10,624 PKA) found that patients receiving a TKA were 2.6 times more likely to require a reoperation for infection than those receiving a PKA¹⁷

Registry and database studies have reported a **lower mortality rate** following PKA vs TKA.

- A systematic review of registry and large database studies concluded that TKA was associated with a significantly increased risk of mortality vs PKA (risk ratio 0.27; 95% CI 0.16, 0.45; $p \leq 0.001$)⁷⁶
- Based on propensity score-matched survival modeling of NJR data, Liddle et al. 2014 estimated that 100 patients receiving PKA instead of TKA would result in one fewer death over four years¹⁶
- Morris et al. 2013 reported no deaths during the 90-day perioperative period following PKA, which compares favorably to the published perioperative mortality rate of TKA⁹³

Patients were **more likely to be satisfied with a PKA** than a TKA, and more likely to state that they would choose to undergo the procedure again.

- Approximately 20% of patients reported being dissatisfied with their primary TKA in a peer-reviewed systematic literature review; key factors contributing to patient dissatisfaction included degree of improvement in function, degree of pain relief following surgery, and unmet expectations⁹⁴
- Based on data from the NJR, patients who received a PKA were 27% more likely to be highly satisfied than patients who received a TKA¹⁴
- More patients who received a PKA reported they would undergo the procedure again; at 5 years of follow-up in the TOPKAT trial, 91% of PKA recipients stated that they would undergo the procedure again, vs 84% of TKA recipients¹⁵
- In a prospective study that assessed joint awareness using the Forgotten Joint Score (FJS), patients who received robotic PKA (n=65) reported significantly less joint awareness than patients who received robotic TKA (n=65) at 1 year (72.2 vs 61.1, $p=0.02$) and 2 years of follow-up (72.4 vs 61.2, $p=0.01$)¹³

PKA has been associated with fewer complications, reduced risk of mortality, and higher patient satisfaction

Target vs Actual Utilization

Prospective and retrospective analyses have shown that **nearly 50% of all knee replacement patients could be candidates for PKA.**^{3,25,26}

- A prospective analysis of 200 knee arthroplasty patients classified 47.6% as PKA candidates²⁵
- A retrospective assessment of 97 TKA procedures concluded that 21% of cases could have been treated with PKA⁹⁵
- A retrospective cross-sectional study of 457 patients who received a primary TKA or PKA (Oxford mobile-bearing implant) estimated that 49% of patients were PKA candidates²⁶

Utilization of PKA has increased in the US since the early 2000s, including in patients <65 years, as age is no longer considered a selection criteria.^{27,96}

- In a study of two large claims databases, the rate of PKA utilization increased in the Medicare population (≥65 years) by 49% over 10 years (2002 to 2011) and in the MarketScan cohort (<65 years) by 25% over 8 years (2004 to 2012)
 - The annual increase in the number of PKA procedures averaged 5.8% in the older population and 25.4% in the younger population, vs increases of 3.6% and 33.9%, respectively, for TKA⁹⁶
- Based on analysis of implant manufacturer data (1998 to 2005), the annual increase in TKA procedures was 9.4% vs 32.5% for PKA²⁸

Approximately half of the patients in one study would choose PKA over TKA, suggesting that increased utilization rates are aligned with patient preferences.⁶²

- In a discrete choice experiment that presented the evidence-based risks and benefits of each procedure to patients with knee OA (N=300), 58% of patients in the good-function cohort and 46% of patients in the fair/poor-function cohort chose PKA over TKA
 - Complications and revision rates were key factors driving patient preference⁶²

Patients have indicated a preference for PKA over TKA

Despite strong annual growth rates in PKA utilization and the high percentage of patients meeting inclusion criteria, **PKA accounts for less than 8% of joint arthroplasty procedures in the US**, and this proportion has plateaued in recent years.²⁷⁻²⁹

- 3 published studies have assessed trends in PKA utilization rates in the US:
 - Hansen et al. 2018 (Medicare/MarketScan claims databases): in 2008, PKA prevalence was 5.9% of the TKA prevalence in the Medicare population and 8.9% of the TKA prevalence in the MarketScan population⁹⁶
 - Bolognesi et al. 2013 (Medicare claims database): PKA utilization was 4.5% among Medicare beneficiaries receiving joint arthroplasty from 2000 to 2009²⁷
 - Riddle et al 2008 (Implant manufacturer sales data cross-referenced to hospital databases): in 2004, PKA represented 7.7% of all knee arthroplasty procedures²⁸
- Based on the most recent data from the American Joint Replacement Registry (AJRR), PKA accounted for 4.1% of all primary knee arthroplasty in 2019²⁹

Several factors contribute to the underutilization of PKA. Patient selection is driven primarily by historical precedent, **with current practice lagging the most up-to-date evidence.**

- The original 1989 study by Kozinn & Scott classified 5% of knee arthroplasty patients as PKA candidates,⁹⁷ however, a 2015 update removed many key selection criteria (obesity, age, patellofemoral damage limited to the medial facet, chondrocalcinosis)²
- Campi et al. 2018 also reviewed the most recent evidence and concluded that traditional contraindications for PKA (patient age, activity, weight, state of patellofemoral joint and chondrocalcinosis) had been disproven^{98*}

Higher reported revision rates with PKA vs TKA have driven **low utilization of PKA**, with surgeons offering the procedure to a limited subset of knee arthroplasty patients ($\leq 5\%$) and therefore performing few each year.³⁰

- Reported considerations for higher revision rates for PKA vs TKA include:
 - Incorrect indication⁷²
 - Lower usage rate/lower patient volume^{30,72,77,98}
 - Relative simplicity of converting a PKA to a TKA, lowering the threshold for revision of a PKA to TKA (vs TKA to revision TKA)⁷²
- Observed utilization rates are also reportedly heterogeneous across surgeons, due to different interpretations of the relative benefits and risks of PKA vs TKA⁹⁹

Nearly 50% of knee replacement patients may qualify as potential PKA candidates; however, PKA currently accounts for <8% of all arthroplasty procedures in the US

*See package insert for current indications and contraindications for use.

Treatment Setting (Volume-Outcomes Correlation)

Surgical volume is a critical factor in optimizing PKA outcomes. Registry studies and meta-analyses have repeatedly shown **lower PKA revision rates with higher volume** surgeons and facilities:

- In a study from the NJR (N=41,986 PKAs), designed to determine the optimal usage threshold, the lowest revision rates were achieved with PKA usage between 40% and 60% of knee arthroplasties, with acceptable results observed above 20%
 - Highest rates of revision were observed with the lowest usage (<5%): specifically in the lower usage group (<20%), every 10% of increased usage was correlated with a 21% decreased risk of revision³⁰
- Another NJR cohort study (N=23,400 PKAs) showed that low volume centers (defined as ≤50 procedures over 8 years) reported significantly higher revision rates than their high volume (>400) counterparts (1.62 vs 1.16 revisions per 100 component years)
 - Similarly, low volume surgeons (defined as ≤25 procedures over 8 years) reported significantly higher revision rates than the highest volume (>200) surgeons (2.16 vs 0.80 revisions per 100 component years)¹⁰⁰
 - Risk of revision per center volume (≤50 vs >400): adjusted hazard ratio 1.35 (95% CI 1.10, 1.66; p<0.005)
 - Risk of revision per surgeon volume (≤25 vs >200): adjusted hazard ratio 2.54; 95% CI 1.97, 3.27; p<0.001)
- A meta-analysis of PKA outcomes (1998 to 2016) found that caseload of >24 per year and usage >30% were associated with the lowest revision rates; notably, usage had a greater impact on revision rates than caseload¹⁰¹
 - Annual revision rate by caseload (≤6 vs >24 per year): 1.87 vs 0.88 (p=0.02)
 - Annual revision rate by usage (<10% vs >30%): 0.69 vs 1.89 (p<0.001)
- In a Norwegian registry study (N=4,460 PKAs), hospitals performing more than 40 PKA procedures per year had a significantly lower risk of revision than those performing less than 10 per year (adjusted risk ratio 0.59; 95% CI 0.39, 0.90; p=0.01)¹⁰²

In large registry studies, surgeons utilizing PKA for **at least 20% of annual knee arthroplasties** achieved a significant decrease in revision rate,³⁰ and hospitals performing more than 40 PKAs per year reported a lower risk of revision (vs those performing under 10 per year).¹⁰²

20% utilization of PKA is the reported minimum threshold for significantly decreasing revision rates

2.1 Economic Burden (PKA vs TKA)[†]

Key Takeaways:

- ✓ OA of the knee is a costly disease, and TKA accounts for the largest percentage of direct medical costs^{1,68}
- ✓ US economic evaluations have demonstrated the cost-effectiveness of PKA, which is associated with lower hospital direct costs and lower total costs vs TKA³¹⁻³⁵
- ✓ PKA has been associated with shorter hospital stays and decreased risk of discharge to a rehabilitation facility in comparative cost-effectiveness analyses^{11,18,31}
- ✓ Preferential use of PKA in all eligible US patients has been estimated to produce a lifetime societal savings of \$987 million to \$1.5 billion per annual wave of treated patients¹⁰³
- ✓ PKA procedures can promote efficiency in the OR via shorter procedure times and reduced instrumentation^{31,36,37}

OA of the knee is a costly disease: per the Burden of Musculoskeletal Diseases in the US (BMUS), the **total incremental cost associated with OA was \$136.8 billion per year** between 2008 and 2014 (an estimated one-third of which is knee OA).⁶⁸

- Incremental direct costs (medical expenditures): \$2,018 per person per year
- Indirect costs (earnings losses) of \$4,274 per person per year

Overall work-related impacts of OA are considerable: US adults had an aggregate earnings loss attributable to OA of \$71.3 billion annually between 2008 and 2014.⁶⁸

The largest percentage of knee OA-related direct medical costs are attributable to TKA; if TKA eligibility criteria are expanded, costs are projected to increase accordingly¹

- Published calculations using Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) data associated TKA with an estimated \$28.5 billion in hospital expenditures in 2009¹⁰⁴

Cost-Effectiveness

Numerous economic evaluations have demonstrated the cost-effectiveness of PKA, with **lower hospital direct costs** and **lower total costs** vs TKA.

- A US retrospective review of primary TKA vs PKA (fixed-bearing) found that hospital direct costs were significantly lower for PKA vs TKA (\$7,893 vs \$11,156; $p < 0.001$), with the same trend observed with total costs (hospital direct costs plus overhead; \$11,397 vs \$16,243; $p < 0.001$)³¹
- A US cost-effectiveness analysis concluded that, assuming levels of durability and function remain comparable to TKA, PKA is a cost-effective alternative for the treatment of unicompartmental OA, with incremental gains in effectiveness at minimal cost³²
- The cost-effectiveness of PKA is further supported by a global SLR, which noted that initial cost savings are maintained over patient lifetimes even when accounting for higher rates of revision³³

[†]Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section

- Modeling studies have shown that PKA becomes increasingly cost-effective as more older patients qualify for the procedure.
- Based on a Markov model comparing the cost-effectiveness of PKA vs TKA in the US across the age spectrum, PKA dominated TKA in patients ≥ 65 years, with lower lifetime costs and higher QALYs; when the percentage of older patients qualifying as candidates for PKA varied from 10.0% to 21.0%, total lifetime societal savings in the year 2015 ranged from \$56 to \$336 million. These savings are predicted to increase to \$84 million to \$544 million in 2020³⁴
- Another US-based Markov model assessing the cost-effectiveness of PKA vs TKA in elderly, low-demand patients concluded that PKA is a cost-effective option in this patient population, assuming the annual revision rate remains below 4%; PKA resulted in higher accumulated QALYs (0.05) and lower accumulated costs (\$200) per case³⁵

Preferential use of PKA in all US patients with unicompartmental OA could produce up to \$1.5 billion in annual cost savings.

- Based on a Markov model that assessed costs and QALYs as a function of age, an estimated lifetime societal savings of \$987 million to \$1.5 billion (per annual wave of patients) would be produced by preferential use of PKA in all US patients with end-stage unicompartmental knee OA¹⁰³

PKA is associated with **shorter hospital stays** and **decreased risk of discharge to a rehabilitation facility** across studies.

- In a US retrospective cohort study that matched patients receiving a PKA (Oxford mobile-bearing implant) with patients receiving a TKA, hospital stays were significantly shorter in the PKA group vs the TKA group (1.4 days vs 2.2 days; $p=0.0000$), and PKA patients were significantly more likely to be discharged on their first post-operative day (71 vs 28 patients; $p=0.0000$)¹¹
- A US retrospective multicenter study reported that patients undergoing TKA experienced a significantly longer length of stay (LOS) after their procedure (3.3 days vs 2.0 days; $p<0.0001$) than patients undergoing PKA, and were significantly more likely to be discharged to a rehabilitation facility (18.0% vs 3.1%; $p<0.0001$)¹⁸
- A US retrospective review comparing primary PKA (fixed bearing) and TKA procedures performed by a single surgeon also found a shorter length of stay in the PKA group (2.2 ± 1.1 vs 3.8 ± 2.4 ; $p<0.001$), with 4% of PKA patients discharged to a rehabilitation facility vs 25% of TKA patients³¹

Preferential use of PKA can shorten hospital stays and reduce the proportion of patients discharged to a rehabilitation facility†

OR Efficiency

PKA contributes to OR efficiency via **shorter procedure times**

- An average TKA requires approximately 100 minutes of OR time,¹⁰⁵ with an additional 35 minutes of OR turnover¹⁰⁶
- A US retrospective review found that both operative minutes (81.4 ± 25.5 vs 112.2 ± 52.1 ; $p < 0.001$) and anesthesia minutes (125.7 ± 33.2 vs 156.4 ± 53.0 $p < 0.001$) for PKA were significantly shorter than that for TKA³¹

PKA procedures **utilize smaller and fewer instrument trays** vs TKA, streamlining OR workflow and potentially reducing costs

- Up to 8 instrument trays are often used for a conventional TKA with standard instruments, each weighing up to 70 pounds, and preparing and sterilizing each tray requires an average cost of \$75³⁶
- Compromised trays, observed in 10% to 18% of TKA procedures, may result in additional time and cost for resterilization¹⁰⁷
- The Persona Partial Knee implant system requires only 2 instrument trays³⁷
- Based on an observational study of joint arthroplasty (N=7 surgeons), reducing the average number of trays from 5.3 to 3.0 saved 17.0 minutes of OR time; the total cost savings (including OR time and sterile processing costs) were estimated at \$763 per case¹⁰⁸

PKA can contribute to OR efficiency via shorter procedures times and reduced instrumentation[‡]

[‡]Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section

2.2 Evolution of PKA Treatment Landscape†

Key Takeaways:

- ✓ Prioritization of care-team well-being, particularly prevention of staff burnout, has emerged as a key consideration for hospitals and ambulatory care facilities³⁸⁻⁴¹
- ✓ Higher patient volume and increased specialization may motivate investment in surgical assistive technology^{42,43}
- ✓ Adoption of robotic technology, already prevalent in joint arthroplasty, is expected to continue expanding⁴⁶
- ✓ PKA is particularly well-suited to robotic assistance, and utilization of robotic-assisted PKA has increased at more than double the rate of unassisted PKA, per a US database analysis^{46,47}
- ✓ PKA procedures are increasingly performed in an outpatient setting, a shift that offers the opportunity for cost savings^{44,45,109}
- ✓ Based on the results of a survey study, patients may exhibit a preference for robotic-assisted orthopedic surgery, offering a potential marketing pull for hospitals and surgery centers⁴⁸

Focus on Care Team Well-being and Retention

The Triple Aim framework (www.ihl.org), a widely accepted approach to optimizing performance of the US health care system, is based around three interdependent goals: improved population health, improved patient care, and lower costs.³⁸ Most recently, incorporation of a fourth dimension—care team well-being—has emerged as a key consideration for hospitals and ambulatory care facilities, particularly in the context of staff retention.³⁸

- **Burnout is highly prevalent among orthopedic surgeons:** US survey studies have found that approximately half of orthopedic surgeons experience symptoms of burnout (e.g., emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low sense of personal accomplishment)^{40,41}
 - o Staff burnout threatens both patient care and staff satisfaction³⁸
 - o Dissatisfied physicians are more likely to leave their practice, and the cost of surgeon turnover is high³⁸

†Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section

- **Prioritization of care team well-being highlights the importance of considering work environment** (e.g., workflow, ergonomics, and staff satisfaction) when considering technology investments^{38,39}
 - o Work-related injuries are common among OR staff: a survey of 50 perioperative nurses and technicians (NYU Hospital for Joint Diseases Orthopedic Institute) reported a high prevalence of work-related musculoskeletal disorders, with lower back pain the most prevalent complaint (84%), followed by ankle/foot (74%) and shoulder (74%) pain³⁹
 - o Lifting and manipulating heavy instrument trays, in particular, contributes to musculoskeletal injuries among OR staff³⁹
 - o Adoption of new technology should not disrupt surgeon workflow or impose unnecessary processes, and should aid with routine tasks/ergonomics³⁹

Volume Considerations

Increased patient volume, a key goal for hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers, is a particularly relevant consideration for PKA, given the well-established correlation between usage and outcomes for this procedure.³⁰

- While the overall volume of arthroplasty procedures has increased in the US over the past two decades, **Medicare reimbursement to physicians has decreased for all arthroplasty procedures with the exception of PKA**¹¹⁰
 - o Based on a study of the Medicare Fee-for-Service billing from 2000 to 2019, the number of total knee and hip arthroplasty procedures increased by 100% over this period, while physician reimbursement decreased 38.9% per procedure; the one exception to this trend was PKA, which showed an increased mean physician reimbursement of 16.6%, adjusted for inflation¹¹⁰
 - o Value-based payment reforms to Medicare physician reimbursement, which aim to incentivize quality and advancement of care, will be another key consideration for hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers^{110,111}
- The proliferation of center of excellence (COE) models, typically characterized by high surgical volumes and streamlined operations, suggests that providers and payers are aligning to the growing body of evidence linking volume to outcomes in joint arthroplasty^{42,43}
- Higher volume and increased specialization may motivate **investment in surgical assistive technology, including multi-application platforms**
- Increased volume of PKA could also result in an increased need for intra-operative flexibility, allowing surgeons to transition from a planned PKA to a TKA if needed¹¹²

Outpatient PKA

PKA procedures have been increasingly performed in an outpatient setting, a shift that offers the opportunity for cost savings, but requires particular focus on patient selection.^{44,109}

- Ambulatory discharge following PKA has become increasingly prevalent in the US, with **outpatient PKA accounting for the majority of PKA procedures** as of 2016^{45,109}
 - Based on a retrospective study of a national claims database, utilization of outpatient PKA (defined as ambulatory surgery center or in-hospital outpatient) increased significantly between 2007 and 2016 (14.5% to 58.1%, $p < 0.001$)¹⁰⁹
- In appropriately selected patients, PKA can be performed in the outpatient setting without increasing the risk of perioperative complications or readmissions^{109,113}
 - A retrospective analysis of PKA procedures from the American College of Surgeons National Surgical Quality Improvement Program (ACS-NSQIP) database (2011 to 2013), which used propensity matching to compare day of surgery discharge vs post-operative day 1 discharge, reported no difference in 30-day complications or readmissions¹¹³
 - Gruskay et al. found a significantly decreased risk of pneumonia (OR 0.23; $p = 0.008$) and post-operative transfusion (OR 0.28; $p < 0.001$) with outpatient vs inpatient PKA, and a trend towards decreased 90-day readmission risk (OR 0.83; $p = 0.062$) in a national private insurance database study (2007 to 2016)¹⁰⁹
 - A Medicare claims study of PKAs performed between 2007 and 2016 (Bosch et al 2020) reported increased utilization of outpatient PKA without an increased risk of major medical complications (although a higher rate of wound complications and operative debridement was observed in the outpatient group)⁴⁵
- PKA has been associated with a similarly low rate of complications in the hospital outpatient and ambulatory care settings¹¹⁴
 - A comparative study of single-surgeon PKA outcomes (2012-2016) noted a low rate of early post-operative complication rate in both settings, with no significant difference in overall complication rate, emergency department visits, or 90-day re-admissions¹¹⁴
- Outpatient PKA offers a **key opportunity for cost containment** in the setting of bundled payments and decreasing reimbursement rates^{44,45}
 - Per Bosch et al, mean global (90-day) period reimbursement per procedure was \$2,782.13 lower for outpatient vs inpatient PKA ($p < 0.001$)
 - From 2007 to 2016, global period reimbursement decreased over time for both inpatient PKA (\$19,860.71 vs \$18,676.75; $p = 0.004$) and outpatient PKA (\$17,317.98 vs \$16,242.42; $p = 0.069$)⁴⁵
 - To realize the potential cost benefits of outpatient PKA, streamlining the OR via staff training and instrument standardization is critical to reducing procedure time and maximizing OR efficiency⁴⁴

The majority of PKA procedures are now performed in the outpatient setting, providing a key opportunity for cost containment†

Shifts Toward Robotic Systems

The use of robotic technology, already prevalent in joint arthroplasty, is expected to expand further as value-based reimbursement approaches shape the future of the US healthcare system.⁴⁶

- Arthroplasty is particularly well-suited to robotic assistance, due to the very high degree of precision required to prepare and position implants⁴⁶
- Adoption of **robotic technology is widespread in joint arthroplasty**, including PKA, and expected to continue expanding⁴⁶
 - At present, nearly 40% of PKA procedures in the US are robotic-assisted, based on a study of 35,061 Medicare patients who underwent PKA in 2014 (38.8%)⁴⁷
 - A 500% increase in robotic-assistance for knee arthroplasty was reported from 2009 and 2013, per a New York state database analysis (N=151,147), with the increase attributed primarily to PKA; overall, teaching hospitals accounted for 80% of robotic-assisted arthroplasty¹¹⁵
 - Annual increases in the proportion of cases using technology assistance were also observed in another New York state database study (N=133,472 primary TKA or PKA): from 2008 to 2015, the proportion of all knee arthroplasty cases with robotic assistance increased from 4.3% to 11.6%
 - The proportion of hospitals and surgeons using robotic-assisted arthroplasty was also noted (from 16.2% of hospitals and 6.2% of surgeons in 2008 to 29.2% and 17.1%, respectively, in 2015), with increases observed across all insurance and volume categories¹¹⁶
- Utilization of **robotic-assisted PKA has increased at more than double the rate of manual PKA**⁴⁷
 - In a study of Medicare patients who underwent a PKA between 2005 and 2014 (N=35,061), primary robotic-assisted PKA increased 13.3-fold over the study period, vs a 5.4-fold increase in primary manual PKA⁴⁷
- As a new generation of robotic systems is introduced into the field of knee arthroplasty, careful consideration of clinical and cost-effectiveness will be needed to maximize return on investment⁴⁶

PKA is particularly well-suited to robotic assistance, and uptake of robotics is rapidly outpacing unassisted PKA†

As direct allocation of consumer health care dollars increases, the accelerated rise in patient financial responsibilities presents an emerging threat for hospital margins.¹¹⁷ Patient experience will therefore be a key differentiator for hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers, with patients seeking value from services (e.g., premium technology in the OR, integrated apps for communication and post-operative monitoring).

- Patients may exhibit a **preference for robot-assisted orthopedic surgery** over conventional methods, suggesting a potential marketing pull for hospitals and surgery centers⁴⁸
- Based on the results of a 30-question online survey of orthopedic surgery practices (N=588):⁴⁸
 - 34% of respondents reported a clear preference for robotic-assisted surgery over a conventional manual approach
 - Nearly half (49%) would choose a low-volume surgeon assisted by robotic technology over a high-volume surgeon using conventional methods
 - 69% of respondents believed that robotic-assisted orthopedic surgery leads to better outcomes than conventional methods, with fewer complications (69%), less pain (59%), and shorter recovery time (62%)

†Persona Partial Knee has not been evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies summarized in this section unless stated otherwise

3. ROSA Partial Knee System

Key Takeaways:

- ✓ The ROSA Partial Knee system is a surgeon-centered robotic platform that enhances efficiency with a simple adaptable workflow designed to provide seamless support during the key steps of a PKA procedure⁴⁹
- ✓ Based on the results of a cadaveric study, ROSA Knee can improve the accuracy and precision of knee arthroplasty compared to conventional methods^{118 §}
- ✓ ROSA Partial Knee enhances pre-op communication and post-op monitoring through integration with the OrthoIntel Orthopedic Intelligence Platform and mymobility with Apple Watch for qualified patients^{49 ‡}
- ✓ The ROSA Partial Knee system is compatible with the Persona Partial Knee implant, which offers multiple anatomical sizing options, and Vivacit-E vitamin E highly crosslinked polyethylene for enhanced strength and ultra-low wear⁵⁰

Product Features

The **ROSA Partial Knee system** is a surgeon-centered robotic platform for **enhancing the accuracy, precision, and efficiency** of PKA procedures.⁴⁹

- Collects real-time data on patient's anatomy and soft tissues to provide dynamic tracking, laxity and tissue balance support, and solid resection construction⁴⁹
- Provides a simple and easy-to-use workflow that can adapt to surgeons' individual preferences⁴⁹
- Designed to provide confidence in performing PKA by supporting surgeons during the key steps of a PKA procedure⁴⁹

ROSA Knee has been shown to assist with intra-operative implant placement in TKA, increasing implant accuracy and precision compared to conventional methods^{118 † ‡}

The ROSA Partial Knee system is designed to adapt to each surgeon's preferred workflow, building confidence and minimizing the learning curve

§ Cadaveric studies are not necessarily indicative of clinical results.

‡ Patients must have a compatible smartphone and be clinically evaluated as appropriate candidates for remote care to use mymobility

ROSA Partial Knee offers a data-driven approach, with insights designed to aid decision-making in the OR and deliver procedures that are efficient and predictable.⁴⁹ The ROSA Partial Knee also integrates with **mymobility with Apple Watch** and **OrthoIntel Orthopedic Intelligence Platform** for pre- and post-operative communication and monitoring.⁴⁹

- A multicenter prospective randomized control trial, evaluating the use of smartphone-based care with mymobility with Apple Watch vs standard of care in patients who received PKA (N=107), demonstrated that patients using mymobility achieved comparable early outcomes without the need for a formal physical therapy program, and required fewer readmissions (5.1% vs 0%) and fewer ER visits (6.8% vs 0%) within 90 days¹¹⁹

The ROSA Partial Knee system is compatible with the **Persona Partial Knee**, a fixed bearing knee replacement built upon the clinical heritage of the Miller Galante (M/G) unicompartmental knee system with **excellent clinical outcomes**:

- The Persona Partial Knee offers compartment-specific, anatomical shapes for the femoral and tibial components, with seven different sizing options to optimize the fit. The tibial component also uses the Vivacit-E polyethylene bearing surface, which is actively stabilized with vitamin E to help protect against oxidation and maintain wear resistance⁵⁰
- In an analysis of the Persona Partial Knee multicenter study at 2 years (N=110 knees with complete follow-up), survivorship was 98.9% with four revisions in total (three due to infections, one due to unexplained pain). A total of 97.3% of patients were surveyed as being satisfied or very satisfied with the results of their surgery, and 94.4% reported they were satisfied or very satisfied with the improvements in pain following implantation of the Persona Partial Knee¹²⁰
- In a 20-year follow-up of 51 patients who received an M/G unicompartmental knee implant (N=62 knees), total survivorship was 90% with no cases of aseptic loosening or osteolysis¹²¹
 - Clinical outcomes also remained positive with M/G unicompartmental implants through long-term follow-up, with a mean HSS score of 78 reported for patients at ≥15 years

4. Evidence of Partial Knee Robotics Systems[§]

Key Takeaways:

- ✓ Robotic-assisted PKA has been shown to increase surgical accuracy and decrease outliers vs conventional methods, potentially decreasing revision surgeries and improving implant survivorship⁵¹⁻⁵⁵
- ✓ Robotic PKA has been associated with very high patient satisfaction, rapid return to sports, and functional and quality of life outcomes that are improved or comparable to conventional PKA procedures⁵⁵⁻⁵⁸
- ✓ A small number of cases is typically required to overcome the learning curve for robotic PKA^{51,122}
- ✓ Robotic PKA has shown the potential to improve index facility costs, LOS, readmissions, and post-acute service utilization versus conventional PKA^{123,124}

Clinical Value[§]

Increased surgical accuracy and decreased outliers in implant placement have been reported for PKA performed with robotics systems vs conventional methods:

- In a prospective randomized controlled trial (N=139), robotic-assisted PKA was associated with significantly improved component positioning, as assessed by lower median errors in all component parameters ($p < 0.01$), and a significantly greater proportion of patients with component implantation within 2° of target position ($p < 0.02$ across all component positions) vs conventional PKA⁵²
- In a case-control study of 80 patients who received robotic-assisted PKA matched with 80 patients who received conventional PKA, significantly fewer postoperative limb alignment outliers were observed in the robotic vs conventional group for both lateral PKA ($p = 0.018$) and medial PKA ($p = 0.038$)⁵³
- In an SLR and meta-analysis including 10 articles (published up to April 2020; N=1,231 knees), PKA performed with robotic systems had significantly fewer outliers of limb alignment ($p < 0.001$) and outliers of tibial alignment ($p < 0.001$) compared to conventional methods⁵⁴
- Another SLR including 21 studies noted that all 11 studies that compared implant positioning with robotic system PKA vs conventional PKA found increased accuracy with robotic systems⁵⁵

Robotic PKA systems can promote a **decrease in revision surgery and improved implant survivorship** compared to conventional PKA, driven in part by the higher positional accuracy achieved with robotic PKA:

- In a retrospective analysis of patients who underwent robotic or conventional PKA between 2005 and 2014 were identified in the PearlDiver Medicare database (N=35,061), robotic PKA procedures had significantly lower revision incidence (0.99 vs 4.24%, $p = 0.003$) and lower proportion of patients requiring multiple revisions (0.91 vs 4.23%, $p = 0.005$) compared to conventional PKA. Kaplan-Meier survival curve 3 years following the index procedure to all-cause revisions demonstrated that patients who received robotic PKA maintained nearly 100% survivorship compared with conventional PKA patients who had 97.5% survivorship⁴⁷
 - o Optimal tibial and femoral component coronal angles (2° to 4° for tibial, 0° and 2° for femoral) were associated with a significant implant survival benefit at 15 years compared to non-optimal placements in a prospective analysis of 264 PKA procedures in a hospital registry¹²⁵

[§] ROSA Partial Knee has not been clinically evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies cited in this section

Robotic PKA has been associated with **very high patient satisfaction**, and **functional and quality-of-life outcomes that are improved or comparable to PKA performed with conventional methods**:

- In a randomized controlled trial of robotic-assisted vs conventional PKA (N=139), significantly improved early pain ($p=0.04$) and function (per American Knee Society Score, $p=0.0405$) were observed in the robotic arm vs the conventional arm at 8 weeks of follow-up; additionally, nearly double the proportion of patients in the robotic arm achieved a forgotten joint (15% vs 8%)¹²⁶
- A retrospective study assessed data from a total of 25 patients who received lateral PKA (11 robotic-assisted PKA and 17 conventional PKA): results from this study demonstrated that robotic surgical technique for lateral PKA provided significantly quicker return to sports than conventional technique (4.2 ± 1.8 -month improvement; $p<0.01$), with a comparable rate of return to sports (100% vs 94%)⁵⁷
- A prospective multicenter study of 384 patients who received robotic PKA (432 knees) demonstrated 97% implant survivorship over a mean follow-up of 5.7 years (13 revisions were performed, of which 11 knees were converted to total knee arthroplasty and in 2 cases, 1 PKA component was revised)
 - Among all the unrevised patients, 91% were either very satisfied or satisfied with their knee function at follow-up⁵⁶
- No implant failures or implant-related complications were recorded among 51 robotic PKA procedures in a prospective study. Furthermore, 96.1% of patients were satisfied or very satisfied at the latest follow-up, while none were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. Total WOMAC (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index) score and each score's component was significantly improved after surgery. Knee alignment was significantly improved; as flexion increased, varus and flexion contracture decreased⁵⁸
- In an SLR of 21 studies, robotic-assisted PKA demonstrated better soft tissue balance, patient function scores and satisfaction in short-term outcomes compared to conventional methods⁵⁵

Compared to conventional PKA, robotic PKA systems have shown improved implant survivorship while maintaining high patient satisfaction and preserving functional outcomes

Robotic PKA is characterized by **a learning curve that can be overcome after a small number of cases**, allowing surgical teams to **rapidly gain confidence** in the procedure:

- Robotic-arm assisted PKA ($n=60$) was associated with a learning curve of six cases for operating time and surgical team confidence levels in a prospective study⁵¹
 - Accuracy of implant positioning, posterior condylar offset ratio, posterior tibial slope, native joint line preservation, and post-operative limb alignment were not significantly affected by cumulative surgical experience
- Among 13 surgical teams performing a total 892 robotic PKA procedures, an average of 16 surgeries (range: 4 to 42) were required for surgical teams to consistently reach their respective steady-state surgical times in a single-center study¹²²

Economic Value⁵

Short-term impacts such as **index facility costs, LOS, readmissions, and post-acute service utilization can be improved by robotic PKA** versus conventional PKA, leading to lower costs:

- In a Markov model for US payers, estimated incremental cost-effectiveness ratio (ICER) for robotic vs conventional PKA was \$14,737 per revision avoided in a facility seeing 100 patients a year. Cost-effectiveness was strongly impacted by case volume, with higher case volumes associated with greater cost-effectiveness¹²³
- At 24 months after the primary PKA procedure, patients who underwent robotic PKA had fewer revision procedures (0.81% [2/246] vs 5.28% [26/492]; p=0.002), shorter mean overall LOS (duration of initial surgery stay + revisions: 2.00 vs 2.33 days; p>0.05) and incurred lower mean costs (cost of initial surgery + revisions: \$26,001 vs \$27,915; p>0.05) than conventional PKA patients¹²⁴
 - o Considering only the index surgery stay, robotic PKA patients also experienced significantly shorter mean LOS (1.77 vs 2.02 days; p=0.0047) and lower mean costs (\$25,786 vs \$26,307; p>0.05) compared to conventional PKA

Robotic PKA systems have demonstrated cost-effectiveness vs conventional PKA, especially for facilities with high case volumes

While there are several reported clinical improvements associated with robotic surgery (e.g. improved precision, higher patient satisfaction scores), broader uptake of robotic surgery into orthopedic practice will depend on its short-term economic value.⁴⁶

5. How ROSA Partial Knee Differs from Other Robotics Systems

ROSA Partial Knee provides several features that offer unique advantages compared to some other robotic PKA systems:

- ROSA Partial Knee uses the **X-Atlas™ 2D to 3D process**, which generates 3D image-based surgical plans using **X-ray imaging instead of CT scans**, with the potential to save money and decrease radiation exposure^{49,59}
 - CT scans constitute a substantial proportion of ionizing radiation received during medical procedures (average effective dose typically between 2 to 16 mSv)^{127,128}
- ROSA Partial Knee is **flexible for surgeons' preferred methods**, and **no robot-specific representative is needed** during the procedure (an implant rep is sufficient)⁴⁹
- Real-time soft tissue balancing allows surgeons to adjust component rotation based on ligament tension, taking into account the full range of motion for the knee (rather than only flexion and extension)⁶⁰
- The ROSA Partial Knee system **supports TKA as well as PKA procedures**, allowing facilities to achieve greater efficiency through a single robotics platform^{49,61}
- ROSA offers a **simple intraoperative transition** from PKA to TKA, if needed⁴⁹

5.1 ROSA Partial Knee Return on Investment

A pro-forma return on investment (ROI) tool has been developed for the ROSA Partial Knee system, which builds a facility-specific business case for the ROSA Partial Knee system based on the following parameters:

- Facility procedural volume
- Annual growth estimates
- Utilization rates of robotic vs non-robotic PKA
- Payer mix
- Reimbursement amounts
- Care setting
- Operational expenses (including disposable costs and sterile processing costs)

The ROI tool is available from Zimmer Biomet upon request.

§ ROSA Partial Knee has not been clinically evaluated for clinical or economic outcomes and was not utilized in the studies cited in this section

6. References

1. Losina E, Paltiel AD, Weinstein AM, *et al*. Lifetime medical costs of knee osteoarthritis management in the United States: impact of extending indications for total knee arthroplasty. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. Feb 2015;67(2):203-215.
2. Berend KR, Berend ME, Dalury DF, Argenson JN, Dodd CA, Scott RD. Consensus Statement on Indications and Contraindications for Medial Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty. *J Surg Orthop Adv*. Winter 2015;24(4):252-256.
3. Pandit H, Hamilton TW, Jenkins C, Mellon SJ, Dodd CA, Murray DW. The clinical outcome of minimally invasive Phase 3 Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a 15-year follow-up of 1000 UKAs. *Bone Joint J*. Nov 2015;97-b(11):1493-1500.
4. AAOS. Unicompartmental Knee Replacement. 2021; <https://orthoinfo.aaos.org/en/treatment/unicompartmental-knee-replacement>.
5. Wiik AV, Aqil A, Tankard S, Amis AA, Cobb JP. Downhill walking gait pattern discriminates between types of knee arthroplasty: improved physiological knee functionality in UKA versus TKA. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Jun 2015;23(6):1748-1755.
6. Wiik AV, Nathwani D, Akhtar A, Al-Obaidi B, Strachan R, Cobb JP. The unicompartmental knee is the preferred side in individuals with both a unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Oct 2020;28(10):3193-3199.
7. Jones GG, Kotti M, Wiik AV, *et al*. Gait comparison of unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasties with healthy controls. *Bone Joint J*. Oct 2016;98-b(10 Supple B):16-21.
8. Newman J, Pydisetty RV, Ackroyd C. Unicompartmental or total knee replacement: the 15-year results of a prospective randomised controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. Jan 2009;91(1):52-57.
9. Manzotti A, Confalonieri N, Pullen C. Unicompartmental versus computer-assisted total knee replacement for medial compartment knee arthritis: a matched paired study. *Int Orthop*. Jun 2007;31(3):315-319.
10. Hopper GP, Leach WJ. Participation in sporting activities following knee replacement: total versus unicompartmental. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Oct 2008;16(10):973-979.
11. Lombardi AV, Jr., Berend KR, Walter CA, Aziz-Jacobo J, Cheney NA. Is recovery faster for mobile-bearing unicompartmental than total knee arthroplasty? *Clinical orthopaedics and related research*. 2009;467(6):1450-1457.
12. Kleeblad LJ, van der List JP, Zuiderbaan HA, Pearle AD. Larger range of motion and increased return to activity, but higher revision rates following unicompartmental versus total knee arthroplasty in patients under 65: a systematic review. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Jun 2018;26(6):1811-1822.
13. Zuiderbaan HA, van der List JP, Khamaisy S, *et al*. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty versus total knee arthroplasty: Which type of artificial joint do patients forget? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. Mar 2017;25(3):681-686.
14. Liddle AD, Pandit H, Judge A, Murray DW. Patient-reported outcomes after total and unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a study of 14,076 matched patients from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *Bone Joint J*. Jun 2015;97-b(6):793-801.
15. Beard DJ, Davies LJ, Cook JA, *et al*. Total versus partial knee replacement in patients with medial compartment knee osteoarthritis: the TOPKAT RCT. *Health Technol Assess*. 2020;24(20):1-98.
16. Liddle AD, Judge A, Pandit H, Murray DW. Adverse outcomes after total and unicompartmental knee replacement in 101,330 matched patients: a study of data from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *Lancet*. Oct 18 2014;384(9952):1437-1445.
17. 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*. Apr 1999;70(2):170-175.
18. Brown NM, Sheth NP, Davis K, *et al*. Total knee arthroplasty has higher postoperative morbidity than unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a multicenter analysis. *J Arthroplasty*. Sep 2012;27(8 Suppl):86-90.
19. Hansen EN, Ong KL, Lau E, Kurtz SM, Lonner JH. Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty Has Fewer Complications but Higher Revision Rates Than Total Knee Arthroplasty in a Study of Large United States Databases. *J Arthroplasty*. Aug 2019;34(8):1617-1625.
20. Kalbian IL, Tan TL, Rondon AJ, *et al*. Reduced opioid requirements following unicompartmental knee arthroplasty compared with total knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J*. Jul 2019;101-b(7_Supple_C):22-27.
21. Dattilo JR, Cororaton AD, Gargiulo JM, McDonald JF, 3rd, Ho H, Hamilton WG. Narcotic Consumption in Opioid Naive Patients Undergoing Unicompartmental and Total Knee Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. Aug 2020;35(8):2022-2026.
22. Burn E, Weaver J, Morales D, *et al*. Opioid use, postoperative complications, and implant survival after unicompartmental versus total knee replacement: a population-based network study. *The Lancet Rheumatology*. 2019;1(4):e229-e236.
23. Beard DJ, Davies LJ, Cook JA, *et al*. 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*. 2019;394(10200):746-756.
24. Kulshrestha V, Datta B, Kumar S, Mittal G. Outcome of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty vs Total Knee Arthroplasty for Early Medial Compartment Arthritis: A Randomized Study. *J Arthroplasty*. May 2017;32(5):1460-1469.
25. Willis-Owen CA, Brust K, Alsop H, Miraldo M, Cobb JP. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in the UK National Health Service: an analysis of candidacy, outcome and cost efficacy. *Knee*. Dec 2009;16(6):473-478.
26. Kennedy JA, Mellon SJ, Lombardi AV, Berend KR, Hamilton TW, Murray DW. Candidacy for medial unicompartmental knee replacement declines with age. *Orthopaedics & Traumatology: Surgery & Research*. 2020/05/01/2020;106(3):443-447.
27. Bolognesi MP, Greiner MA, Attarian DE, *et al*. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty and total knee arthroplasty among Medicare beneficiaries, 2000 to 2009. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Nov 20 2013;95(22):e174.
28. Riddle DL, Jiranek WA, McGlynn FJ. Yearly incidence of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in the United States. *J Arthroplasty*. Apr 2008;23(3):408-412.
29. AJRR. Annual Report 2020: The Seventh Annual Report of the AJRR on Hip and Knee Arthroplasty. 2020; <http://connect.ajrr.net/2020-ajrr-annual-report>.
30. Liddle AD, Pandit H, Judge A, Murray DW. Optimal usage of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a study of 41,986 cases from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *Bone Joint J*. Nov 2015;97-b(11):1506-1511.
31. Shankar S, Tetreault MW, Jegier BJ, Andersson GB, Della Valle CJ. A cost comparison of unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty. *Knee*. Dec 2016;23(6):1016-1019.
32. Soohoo NF, Sharifi H, Kominski G, Lieberman JR. Cost-effectiveness analysis of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty as an alternative to total knee arthroplasty for unicompartmental osteoarthritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Sep 2006;88(9):1975-1982.
33. Burn E, Liddle AD, Hamilton TW, *et al*. Choosing Between Unicompartmental and Total Knee Replacement: What Can Economic Evaluations Tell Us? A Systematic Review. *Pharmacoecon Open*. 2017;1(4):241-253.
34. Ghomrawi HM, Eggman AA, Pearle AD. Effect of age on cost-effectiveness of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty compared with total knee arthroplasty in the U.S. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Mar 4 2015;97(5):396-402.
35. Slover J, Espehaug B, Havelin LI, *et al*. Cost-effectiveness of unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty in elderly low-demand patients. A Markov decision analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Nov 2006;88(11):2348-2355.
36. Capra R, Bini SA, Bowden DE, *et al*. Implementing a perioperative efficiency initiative for orthopedic surgery instrumentation at an academic center: A comparative before-and-after study. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. Feb 2019;98(7):e14338.
37. Zimmer Biomet. Data on File- Persona Partial Knee System Overview. 2021.
38. Bodenheimer T, Sinsky C. From Triple to Quadruple Aim: Care of the Patient Requires Care of the Provider. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2014;12(6):573-576.
39. Sheikhzadeh A, Gore C, Zuckerman JD, Nordin M. Perioperating nurses and technicians' perceptions of ergonomic risk factors in the surgical environment. *Appl Ergon*. Sep 2009;40(5):833-839.

40. Arora M, Diwan AD, Harris IA. Burnout in orthopaedic surgeons: a review. *ANZ J Surg.* Jul 2013;83(7-8):512-515.
41. Shanafelt TD, Boone S, Tan L, *et al.* Burnout and Satisfaction With Work-Life Balance Among US Physicians Relative to the General US Population. *Archives of Internal Medicine.* 2012;172(18):1377-1385.
42. Mehrotra A, Sloss EM, Hussey PS, Adams JL, Lovejoy S, Soohoo NF. Evaluation of centers of excellence program for knee and hip replacement. *Med Care.* Jan 2013;51(1):28-36.
43. Chowdhury MM, Dagash H, Pierro A. A systematic review of the impact of volume of surgery and specialization on patient outcome. *Br J Surg.* Feb 2007;94(2):145-161.
44. Bert JM, Hooper J, Moen S. Outpatient Total Joint Arthroplasty. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med.* Dec 2017;10(4):567-574.
45. Bosch LC, Bala A, Denduluri SK, *et al.* Reimbursement and Complications in Outpatient vs Inpatient Unicompartmental Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* Jun 2020;35(6s):S86-s91.
46. Jacofsky DJ, Allen M. Robotics in Arthroplasty: A Comprehensive Review. *J Arthroplasty.* Oct 2016;31(10):2353-2363.
47. Vakharia RM, Sodhi N, Cohen-Levy WB, Vakharia AM, Mont MA, Roche MW. Comparison of Patient Demographics and Utilization Trends of Robotic-Assisted and Non-Robotic-Assisted Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty. *J Knee Surg.* Oct 22 2019.
48. Pagani NR, Moverman MA, Puzziello RN, Menendez ME, Barnes CL, Kavolus JJ. Online Crowdsourcing to Explore Public Perceptions of Robotic-Assisted Orthopedic Surgery. *The Journal of Arthroplasty.*
49. Zimmer Biomet. Data on File - ROSA® Robotics: ROSA® Knee and Partial Knee Systems. 2021.
50. Zimmer Biomet. Persona Partial Knee Brochure. 2020.
51. Kayani B, Konan S, Pietrzak JRT, Huq SS, Tahmassebi J, Haddad FS. The learning curve associated with robotic-arm assisted unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a prospective cohort study. *Bone Joint J.* Aug 2018;100-b(8):1033-1042.
52. Bell SW, Anthony I, Jones B, MacLean A, Rowe P, Blyth M. Improved Accuracy of Component Positioning with Robotic-Assisted Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: Data from a Prospective, Randomized Controlled Study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Apr 20 2016;98(8):627-635.
53. Batailler C, White N, Ranaldi FM, Neyret P, Servien E, Lustig S. Improved implant position and lower revision rate with robotic-assisted unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* Apr 2019;27(4):1232-1240.
54. Zhang P, Xu K, Zhang J, Chen P, Fang Y, Wang J. Comparison of robotic-assisted versus conventional unicompartmental knee arthroplasty for the treatment of single compartment knee osteoarthritis: A meta-analysis. *Int J Med Robot.* Feb 2021;17(1):1-11.
55. Lin J, Yan S, Ye Z, Zhao X. A systematic review of MAKO-assisted unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Int J Med Robot.* Oct 2020;16(5):1-7.
56. Kleeblad LJ, Borus TA, Coon TM, Douchis J, Nguyen JT, Pearle AD. Midterm Survivorship and Patient Satisfaction of Robotic-Arm-Assisted Medial Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Multicenter Study. *J Arthroplasty.* Jun 2018;33(6):1719-1726.
57. Canetti R, Batailler C, Bankhead C, Neyret P, Servien E, Lustig S. Faster return to sport after robotic-assisted lateral unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a comparative study. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* Dec 2018;138(12):1765-1771.
58. Dretakis K, Igoumenou VG. Outcomes of robotic-arm-assisted medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: minimum 3-year follow-up. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* Aug 2019;29(6):1305-1311.
59. Zimmer Biomet. ROSA Robotics for Knee Replacement: Patient Brochure (DRAFT). 2021.
60. Zimmer Biomet. ROSA Knee System Physician Brochure. 2020.
61. Zimmer Biomet. Data on File - Brand & Messaging Strategy. 2021.
62. Hutyrka CA, Gonzalez JM, Yang J-C, *et al.* Patient Preferences for Surgical Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Discrete-Choice Experiment Evaluating Total and Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty. *JBS.* 2020;102(23).
63. Cisternas MG, Murphy L, Sacks JJ, Solomon DH, Pasta DJ, Helmick CG. Alternative Methods for Defining Osteoarthritis and the Impact on Estimating Prevalence in a US Population-Based Survey. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* May 2016;68(5):574-580.
64. Neogi T. The epidemiology and impact of pain in osteoarthritis. *Osteoarthritis and cartilage.* 2013;21(9):1145-1153.
65. Deshpande BR, Katz JN, Solomon DH, *et al.* Number of Persons With Symptomatic Knee Osteoarthritis in the US: Impact of Race and Ethnicity, Age, Sex, and Obesity. *Arthritis care & research.* 2016;68(12):1743-1750.
66. Hootman JM, Helmick CG, Barbour KE, Theis KA, Boring MA. Updated Projected Prevalence of Self-Reported Doctor-Diagnosed Arthritis and Arthritis-Attributable Activity Limitation Among US Adults, 2015-2040. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* Jul 2016;68(7):1582-1587.
67. Losina E, Weinstein AM, Reichmann WM, *et al.* Lifetime risk and age at diagnosis of symptomatic knee osteoarthritis in the US. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* May 2013;65(5):703-711.
68. US Bone and Joint Initiative. The Burden of Musculoskeletal Diseases in the US (BMUS), 2020. 2020; <https://www.boneandjointburden.org/fourth-edition/iib10/osteoarthritis>.
69. Losina E, Thornhill TS, Rome BN, Wright J, Katz JN. The dramatic increase in total knee replacement utilization rates in the United States cannot be fully explained by growth in population size and the obesity epidemic. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery. American volume.* 2012;94(3):201-207.
70. AAOS. Total Knee Replacement. 2021; <https://orthoinfo.aaos.org/en/treatment/total-knee-replacement/>.
71. Singh JA, Yu S, Chen L, Cleveland JD. Rates of Total Joint Replacement in the United States: Future Projections to 2020-2040 Using the National Inpatient Sample. *The Journal of Rheumatology.* 2019;jrheum.170990.
72. Vasso M, Antoniadis A, Helmy N. Update on unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: Current indications and failure modes. *EFORT Open Rev.* Aug 2018;3(8):442-448.
73. Iorio R, Healy WL. Unicompartmental Arthritis of the Knee. *JBS.* 2003;85(7).
74. Rönn K, Reischl N, Gautier E, Jacobi M. Current surgical treatment of knee osteoarthritis. *Arthritis.* 2011;2011:454873.
75. Price AJ, Oppold PT, Murray DW, Zavatsky AB. Simultaneous in vitro measurement of patellofemoral kinematics and forces following Oxford medial unicompartmental knee replacement. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery. British volume.* 2006;88-B(12):1591-1595.
76. Wilson HA, Middleton R, Abram SGF, *et al.* Patient relevant outcomes of unicompartmental versus total knee replacement: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ.* 2019;364:1352-1352.
77. Murray DW, Parkinson RW. Usage of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J.* Apr 1 2018;100-b(4):432-435.
78. Rodríguez-Merchán EC, Gómez-Cardero P. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: Current indications, technical issues and results. *EFORT Open Rev.* Jun 2018;3(6):363-373.
79. Walton NP, Jahromi I, Lewis PL, Dobson PJ, Angel KR, Campbell DG. Patient-perceived outcomes and return to sport and work: TKA versus mini-incision unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *J Knee Surg.* Apr 2006;19(2):112-116.
80. Hauer G, Sadoghi P, Bernhardt GA, *et al.* Greater activity, better range of motion and higher quality of life following unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a comparative case-control study. *Archives of Orthopaedic and Trauma Surgery.* 2020/02/01 2020;140(2):231-237.
81. Bedard NA, DeMik DE, Dowdle SB, Callaghan JJ. Trends and risk factors for prolonged opioid use after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *The Bone & Joint Journal.* 2018;100-B(1_Suppl_A):62-67.
82. Murray DW, Goodfellow JW, O'Connor JJ. The Oxford medial unicompartmental arthroplasty: a ten-year survival study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* Nov 1998;80(6):983-989.
83. Keys GW, UI-Abiddin Z, Toh EM. Analysis of first forty Oxford medial unicompartmental knee replacement from a small district hospital in UK. *Knee.* Oct 2004;11(5):375-377.
84. Rajasekhar C, Das S, Smith A. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. 2- to 12-year results in a community hospital. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* Sep 2004;86(7):983-985.
85. Emerson RH, Jr., Higgins LL. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty with the oxford prosthesis in patients with medial compartment arthritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Jan 2008;90(1):118-122.
86. Price AJ, Waite JC, Svard U. Long-term clinical results of the medial Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* Jun 2005(435):171-180.

87. Svård UC, Price AJ. Oxford medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. A survival analysis of an independent series. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* Mar 2001;83(2):191-194.
88. Price AJ, Svård U. A second decade lifetable survival analysis of the Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* Jan 2011;469(1):174-179.
89. Goodfellow JW, O'Connor JJ, Murray DW. A critique of revision rate as an outcome measure: re-interpretation of knee joint registry data. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* Dec 2010;92(12):1628-1631.
90. AAOS. Surgical Management of the Knee Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guideline. 2015.
91. NICE. Joint replacement (primary): hip, knee and shoulder. 2020.
92. NICE. Joint replacement (primary): hip, knee and shoulder: Evidence review for total knee replacement. 2020.
93. Morris MJ, Molli RG, Berend KR, Lombardi AV, Jr. Mortality and perioperative complications after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Knee.* Jun 2013;20(3):218-220.
94. Gunaratne R, Pratt DN, Banda J, Fick DP, Khan RJK, Robertson BW. Patient Dissatisfaction Following Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Arthroplasty.* Dec 2017;32(12):3854-3860.
95. Arno S, Maffei D, Walker PS, Schwarzkopf R, Desai P, Steiner GC. Retrospective analysis of total knee arthroplasty cases for visual, histological, and clinical eligibility of unicompartmental knee arthroplasties. *The Journal of arthroplasty.* 2011/12// 2011;26(8):1396-1403.
96. Hansen EN, Ong KL, Lau E, Kurtz SM, Lonner JH. Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty in the U.S. Patient Population: Prevalence and Epidemiology. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ).* Dec 2018;47(12).
97. Pandit H, Jenkins C, Gill HS, et al. Unnecessary contraindications for mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* May 2011;93(5):622-628.
98. Campi S, Tibrewal S, Cuthbert R, Tibrewal SB. Unicompartmental knee replacement - Current perspectives. *J Clin Orthop Trauma.* Jan-Mar 2018;9(1):17-23.
99. Murray DW, Liddle AD, Dodd CA, Pandit H. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: is the glass half full or half empty? *Bone Joint J.* Oct 2015;97-b(10 Suppl A):3-8.
100. Baker P, Jameson S, Critchley R, Reed M, Gregg P, Deehan D. Center and surgeon volume influence the revision rate following unicompartmental knee replacement: an analysis of 23,400 medial cemented unicompartmental knee replacements. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Apr 17 2013;95(8):702-709.
101. Hamilton TW, Rizkalla JM, Kontochristos L, et al. The Interaction of Caseload and Usage in Determining Outcomes of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis. *The Journal of Arthroplasty.* 2017;32(10):3228-3237.e3222.
102. Badawy M, Espehaug B, Indrekvam K, Havelin LI, Furnes O. Higher revision risk for unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in low-volume hospitals. *Acta Orthop.* 2014;85(4):342-347.
103. Kazarian GS, Lonner JH, Maltenfort MG, Ghomrawi HMK, Chen AF. Cost-Effectiveness of Surgical and Nonsurgical Treatments for Unicompartmental Knee Arthritis: A Markov Model. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Oct 3 2018;100(19):1653-1660.
104. Murphy L, Helmick CG. The impact of osteoarthritis in the United States: a population-health perspective: A population-based review of the fourth most common cause of hospitalization in U.S. adults. *Orthop Nurs.* Mar-Apr 2012;31(2):85-91.
105. Halawi MJ, Mirza M, Osman N, Cote MP, Kerr JM, Huddleston JI. Quantifying Surgeon Work in Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty: Where Do We Stand Today? *J Arthroplasty.* May 2020;35(5):1170-1173.
106. Attarian DE, Wahl JE, Wellman SS, Bolognesi MP. Developing a high-efficiency operating room for total joint arthroplasty in an academic setting. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* Jun 2013;471(6):1832-1836.
107. Young J. Incidence of Instrument Compromise in TKA: Comparison of Standard Instruments vs. Single Use Instruments. *American Journal of Infection Control.* 2009/06/01/ 2009;37(5):E77.
108. Grimm J, Ditto R, Neher R, Sweeten T. The Effect of Reducing Surgical Trays on OR Time, Sterile Processing Turnover and Episode of Care Costs. 2020.
109. Gruskay J, Richardson S, Schairer W, et al. Incidence and safety profile of outpatient unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Knee.* Jun 2019;26(3):708-713.
110. Haglin JM, Arthur JR, Deckey DG, Makovicka JL, Pollock JR, Spangehl MJ. Temporal Analysis of Medicare Physician Reimbursement and Procedural Volume for all Hip and Knee Arthroplasty Procedures Billed to Medicare Part B From 2000 to 2019. *The Journal of Arthroplasty.* 2021/02/06/ 2021.
111. Squitieri L, Chung KC. Value-Based Payment Reform and the Medicare Access and Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015: A Primer for Plastic Surgeons. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2017;140(1):205-214.
112. Howell RE, Lombardi AV, Jr., Crilly R, Opolot S, Berend KR. Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: Does a Selection Bias Exist? *The Journal of Arthroplasty.* 2015;30(10):1740-1742.
113. Otero JE, Gholson JJ, Pugely AJ, Gao Y, Bedard NA, Callaghan JJ. Length of Hospitalization After Joint Arthroplasty: Does Early Discharge Affect Complications and Readmission Rates? *J Arthroplasty.* Dec 2016;31(12):2714-2725.
114. Cody JP, Pfefferle KJ, Ammeen DJ, Fricka KB. Is Outpatient Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty Safe to Perform at an Ambulatory Surgery Center? A Comparative Study of Early Post-Operative Complications. *J Arthroplasty.* Mar 2018;33(3):673-676.
115. Naziri Q, Burekhovich SA, Mixa PJ, et al. The trends in robotic-assisted knee arthroplasty: A statewide database study. *J Orthop.* May-Jun 2019;16(3):298-301.
116. Boylan M, Suchman K, Vigdorchik J, Slover J, Bosco J. Technology-Assisted Hip and Knee Arthroplasties: An Analysis of Utilization Trends. *J Arthroplasty.* Apr 2018;33(4):1019-1023.
117. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Health Insurance Coverage: Early Release of Estimates From the National Health Interview Survey, 2018. 2019.
118. Seidenstein A, Birmingham M, Foran J, Ogden S. Better accuracy and reproducibility of a new robotically-assisted system for total knee arthroplasty compared to conventional instrumentation: a cadaveric study. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* May 24 2020.
119. Crawford DA, Duwelius PJ, Sneller MA, et al. 2021 Mark Coventry Award: Use of a smartphone-based care platform after primary partial and total knee arthroplasty: a prospective randomized controlled trial. *Bone Joint J.* Jun 2021;103-b(6 Suppl A):3-12.
120. Zimmer Biomet. Persona Partial Knee Clinical Summary. 2020.
121. Foran JR, Brown NM, Della Valle CJ, Berger RA, Galante JO. Long-term survivorship and failure modes of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* Jan 2013;471(1):102-108.
122. Jinnah R, Lippincott C, Horowitz S, Condit M. The Learning Curve of Robotically-Assisted UKA. 2010.
123. Yeroushalmi D, Feng J, Nherera L, Trueman P, Schwarzkopf R. Early Economic Analysis of Robotic-Assisted Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty May Be Cost Effective in Patients with End-Stage Osteoarthritis. *J Knee Surg.* May 29 2020.
124. Cool CL, Needham KA, Khlopas A, Mont MA. Revision Analysis of Robotic Arm-Assisted and Manual Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* May 2019;34(5):926-931.
125. Khow YZ, Liow MHL, Lee M, Chen JY, Lo NN, Yeo SJ. The effect of tibial and femoral component coronal alignment on clinical outcomes and survivorship in unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J.* Feb 2021;103-b(2):338-346.
126. Blyth MJG, Anthony I, Rowe P, Banger MS, MacLean A, Jones B. Robotic arm-assisted versus conventional unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: Exploratory secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint Res.* Nov 2017;6(11):631-639.
127. Costello JE, Cecava ND, Tucker JE, Bau JL. CT Radiation Dose: Current Controversies and Dose Reduction Strategies. *American Journal of Roentgenology.* 2013/12/01 2013;201(6):1283-1290.
128. FDA. Initiative to Reduce Unnecessary Radiation Exposure from Medical Imaging. 2010.

Please note that laboratory, animal, and cadaveric studies are not necessarily indicative of clinical results.

All content herein is protected by copyright, trademarks, and other intellectual property rights, as applicable, owned by or licensed to Zimmer Biomet or its affiliates unless otherwise indicated, and must not be redistributed, duplicated or disclosed, in whole or in part, without the express written consent of Zimmer Biomet.

Patients must have a compatible smartphone to utilize mymobility. Not all patients are candidates for the use of this product and surgeons should evaluate individually to determine which patients are appropriate for therapy at home. Apple Watch is a trademark of Apple, Inc.

This material is intended for US health care professionals. Distribution to any other recipient is prohibited.

For indications, contraindications, warnings, precautions, potential adverse effects and patient counseling information, see the package insert or contact your local representative; visit www.zimmerbiomet.com for additional product information.

© 2021 Zimmer Biomet



3607.1-US-en-Issue Date 2021-09-22



Legal Manufacturer
Zimmer CAS
75 Queen Street
Suite 3300
Montreal (Quebec) H3C 2N6
Canada

Tel +1.866.3D.ORTHO or
514.395.8883 EC

www.zimmerbiomet.com



Legal Manufacturer
mymobility app
Zimmer Biomet Connected
Health
601 5th St NW
Grand Rapids, MI 49504