

Preservation Mobile Unicompartmental Knee Investigation

Note: This analysis compares the Preservation Mobile tibial prosthesis with all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

This prosthesis has been identified as having a significantly higher rate of revision. For a detailed explanation of the process used by the Registry that results in identification of prostheses that have a higher than anticipated rate of revision please refer to the Prostheses with Higher than Anticipated Rates of Revision chapter of the most recent AOANJRR Annual Report, <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com/annual-reports-2022>.

Note: Procedures using prostheses with no recorded use in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 1

Revision Rate of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

The revision rate of the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis is compared to all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

Table 1: Revision Rates of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

Component	N Revised	N Total	Obs. Years	Revisions/100 Obs. Yrs (95% CI)
Preservation Mobile	156	400	5009	3.11 (2.64, 3.64)
Other Unicompartmental Knee	4495	45809	315582	1.42 (1.38, 1.47)
TOTAL	4651	46209	320591	1.45 (1.41, 1.49)

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 2

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis is compared to all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

Table 2: Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

CPR	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs	7 Yrs
Preservation Mobile	5.3 (3.5, 7.9)	10.5 (7.9, 14.0)	15.5 (12.3, 19.5)	17.1 (13.7, 21.1)	19.1 (15.6, 23.3)	19.9 (16.3, 24.1)	21.4 (17.7, 25.8)
Other Unicompartmental Knee	2.0 (1.8, 2.1)	3.6 (3.4, 3.7)	4.6 (4.4, 4.8)	5.6 (5.4, 5.9)	6.5 (6.3, 6.8)	7.4 (7.2, 7.7)	8.5 (8.2, 8.8)

CPR	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs	11 Yrs	12 Yrs	13 Yrs	14 Yrs
Preservation Mobile	23.0 (19.1, 27.4)	25.1 (21.1, 29.7)	27.2 (23.1, 31.9)	29.4 (25.1, 34.2)	31.4 (27.0, 36.3)	33.7 (29.2, 38.7)	34.6 (30.0, 39.6)
Other Unicompartmental Knee	9.7 (9.3, 10.0)	10.9 (10.5, 11.3)	12.1 (11.7, 12.5)	13.5 (13.0, 13.9)	14.8 (14.3, 15.3)	16.3 (15.7, 16.8)	17.9 (17.3, 18.5)

CPR	15 Yrs	16 Yrs	17 Yrs	18 Yrs	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs
Preservation Mobile	37.1 (32.4, 42.2)	37.4 (32.7, 42.6)	39.3 (34.5, 44.6)	41.1 (36.1, 46.5)	44.5 (39.0, 50.4)		
Other Unicompartmental Knee	19.5 (18.8, 20.1)	21.1 (20.3, 21.8)	22.8 (22.0, 23.7)	24.8 (23.8, 25.7)	26.3 (25.2, 27.4)	28.3 (27.0, 29.8)	30.3 (28.2, 32.6)

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.


FIGURE 1

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis is compared to all other unicompartmental knee prostheses. In addition, hazard ratios are reported.

Hazard ratios are reported for specific time periods during which the hazard ratio is constant. This is done to enable more specific and valid comparisons of the risk of revision over time. The pattern of variation in risk has important implications with respect to the underlying reasons for any difference.

Figure 1: Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement



Number at Risk	0 Yr	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs	7 Yrs	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs
Preservation Mobile	400	378	357	334	326	317	313	304	291	282	272
Other Unicompartmental Knee	45809	41316	36943	32691	28519	24575	21340	18736	16397	14324	12480

Number at Risk	11 Yrs	12 Yrs	13 Yrs	14 Yrs	15 Yrs	16 Yrs	17 Yrs	18 Yrs	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs
Preservation Mobile	254	239	226	215	196	180	154	114	61	4	0
Other Unicompartmental Knee	10597	8801	7213	5756	4495	3389	2468	1706	1021	440	99

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 3**Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Unicompartamental Knee Replacement**

This table identifies the diagnosis of the primary procedure which was subsequently revised. This information is provided as there is a variation on outcome depending on the primary diagnosis. It is therefore important when considering the reasons for a higher than anticipated rate of revision that there is identification of the primary diagnosis. This information should be compared to the primary diagnosis for the revisions of all other unicompartamental knee prostheses.

Table 3: Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Unicompartamental Knee Replacement

Primary Diagnosis	Preservation Mobile		Other Unicompartamental Knee	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Osteoarthritis	154	98.7	4449	99.0
Osteonecrosis			26	0.6
Rheumatoid Arthritis	1	0.6	12	0.3
Other Inflammatory Arthritis			6	0.1
Fracture			1	0.0
Osteochondritis Dissecans	1	0.6		
Tumour			1	0.0
TOTAL	156	100.0	4495	100.0

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 4

Reasons for Revision

This is reported in two ways: a percentage of primary procedures revised and as a percentage of all revision procedures.

% Primaries Revised: This shows the proportional contribution of each revision diagnosis as a percentage of the total number of primary procedures. This percentage can be used to approximate the risk of being revised for that diagnosis. Differing percentages between groups, with the same distribution of follow up time, may identify problems of concern.

% Revisions: The number of revisions for each diagnosis is expressed as a percentage of the total number of revisions. This shows the distribution of reasons for revision within a group but cannot be used as a comparison between groups.

Table 4: Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement - Reason for Revision (Follow-up Limited to 20.1 Years)

Revision Diagnosis	Preservation Mobile			Other Unicompartmental Knee		
	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions
Progression Of Disease	39	9.8	25.0	1610	3.5	35.9
Loosening	90	22.5	57.7	1462	3.2	32.6
Pain	9	2.3	5.8	346	0.8	7.7
Infection	7	1.8	4.5	239	0.5	5.3
Bearing Dislocation	1	0.3	0.6	167	0.4	3.7
Fracture	2	0.5	1.3	132	0.3	2.9
Instability				81	0.2	1.8
Lysis	2	0.5	1.3	80	0.2	1.8
Wear Tibial Insert	2	0.5	1.3	66	0.1	1.5
Malalignment				60	0.1	1.3
Implant Breakage Tibial Insert	1	0.3	0.6	36	0.1	0.8
Patellofemoral Pain				31	0.1	0.7
Incorrect Sizing				28	0.1	0.6
Prosthesis Dislocation				27	0.1	0.6
Implant Breakage Tibial	2	0.5	1.3	20	0.0	0.4
Osteonecrosis				15	0.0	0.3
Wear Tibial				15	0.0	0.3
Metal Related Pathology				11	0.0	0.2
Synovitis				10	0.0	0.2
Arthrofibrosis				8	0.0	0.2
Implant Breakage Femoral				4	0.0	0.1
Patella Erosion				3	0.0	0.1
Wear Femoral				3	0.0	0.1
Other	1	0.3	0.6	34	0.1	0.8
N Revision	156	39.0	100.0	4488	9.8	100.0
N Primary	400			45809		

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 20.1 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

FIGURE 2

Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

This figure details the cumulative incidence of the most common reasons for revision. The five most common reasons for revision are included as long as each of these reasons account for more than 10 procedures or at least 5% of all revisions for the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis. A comparative graph is provided of the cumulative incidence for the same reasons for revisions for all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

Figure 2: Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis for Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement




TABLE 5

Type of Revision Performed for Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement

This analysis identifies the components used in the revision of the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis and compares it to the components used in the revision of all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

The reason this analysis is undertaken is to identify whether there is one or more components which are being replaced that differ from the components replaced for revisions of all other unicompartmental knee prostheses i.e. is there a difference in the type of revision undertaken for the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis compared to all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

Table 5: Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement - Type of Revision (Follow-up Limited to 20.1 Years)

Type of Revision	Preservation Mobile		Other Unicompartmental Knee	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TKR (Tibial/Femoral)	137	87.8	3779	84.2
Uni Tibial Component	8	5.1	98	2.2
Uni Femoral Component	2	1.3	50	1.1
Cement Spacer	1	0.6	37	0.8
UKR (Uni Tibial/Uni Femoral)	1	0.6	34	0.8
Patella/Trochlear Resurfacing	2	1.3	15	0.3
Removal of Prostheses			5	0.1
Reinsertion of Components			4	0.1
Femoral Component			3	0.1
Tibial Component			2	0.0
N Major	151	96.8	4027	89.7
Uni Insert Only	4	2.6	460	10.2
Cement Only	1	0.6		
Patella Only			1	0.0
N Minor	5	3.2	461	10.3
TOTAL	156	100.0	4488	100.0

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 20.1 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 6**Revision Rates of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Fixation**

This analysis is provided as some prostheses have more than one fixation option. Additionally there are prostheses where an alternative to the recommended approach to fixation was used e.g. a cementless prosthesis that has been cemented or vice-versa.

Table 6: Revised Number of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Fixation

Fixation	N Revised	N Total
Cemented	156	400
TOTAL	156	400

TABLE 7**Revision Rates of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by State**

This enables a state by state variation to be identified for the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis and provides the comparative data for each of the states for all other unicompartmental knee prostheses.

The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the higher than anticipated rate of revision has widespread distribution between states. If there is widespread distribution then the reason for the higher than anticipated rate of revision is unlikely to be surgeon specific. If the prosthesis has been used in only a small number of states it is not possible to distinguish if the higher than anticipated rate of revision is related to the prosthesis, surgeon, technique or patient.

Table 7: Revised Number of Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by State

Component	State	N Revised	N Total
Preservation Mobile	NSW	6	6
	VIC	31	84
	QLD	17	49
	WA	31	72
	SA	65	175
	TAS	3	5
	ACT/NT	3	9
Other Unicompartmental Knee	NSW	1381	12283
	VIC	840	9788
	QLD	805	9211
	WA	519	6950
	SA	622	4875
	TAS	163	1713
	ACT/NT	165	989
TOTAL		4651	46209

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2021 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 8**Number of Revisions of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Year of Implant**

This analysis details the number of prostheses reported each year to the Registry for the Preservation Mobile unicompartmental knee prosthesis. It also provides the subsequent number of revisions of the primaries reported in that year.

Primary procedures performed in later years have had less follow up time therefore the number revised is expected to be less than the number revised in earlier years. For example, a primary procedure performed in 2021 has a maximum of one year to be revised, whereas a primary procedure performed in 2019 has a maximum of three years to be revised.

Table 8: Number of Revisions of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Year of Implant

Year of Implant	Number Revised	Total Number
2001	10	15
2002	59	149
2003	51	121
2004	16	59
2005	6	26
2006	5	17
2007	9	13
TOTAL	156	400

TABLE 9**Revision Rates of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Catalogue Number Range**

Many prostheses have a number of catalogue ranges. The catalogue range is specific to particular design features; more than one catalogue range usually indicates a minor difference in design in a particular Preservation Mobile prosthesis.

This analysis has been undertaken to determine if the revision rate varies according to the catalogue number range.

Model	Catalogue Range	Catalogue Description	Cement
Tibial			
Preservation Mobile	149825001-149826005	MOBILE UNI TIBIAL BASEPLATE	YES

Table 9: Revised Number of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Catalogue Number Range

Tibial Range	N Revised	N Total
149825001-149826005	156	400
TOTAL	156	400

TABLE 10**Revision Rates of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Component**

A prosthesis may be combined with multiple components. This analysis has been undertaken to determine if the revision rate varies according to the component with which it is combined.

Table 10: Revised Number of Preservation Mobile Primary Unicompartmental Knee Replacement by Femoral Component

Femoral Component	N Revised	N Total
Preservation	156	400
TOTAL	156	400