

**Title:** The interaction of caseload and usage in determining outcomes of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis

**Authors:** Hamilton TW<sup>1</sup>, Rizkalla J<sup>1</sup>, Kontochristos L<sup>1</sup>, Marks B<sup>1</sup>, Mellon S<sup>1</sup>, Dodd CAF<sup>2</sup>, Pandit HG<sup>1&3</sup> & Murray DW<sup>1&2</sup>

**Corresponding Author:** David Murray

Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology, and Musculoskeletal Sciences, Botnar Research Centre, Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre, Windmill Road, Oxford, OX3 7LD UK

+44 (0) 1865227696

[david.murray@ndorms.ox.ac.uk](mailto:david.murray@ndorms.ox.ac.uk)

**Affiliations:**

<sup>1</sup> Nuffield Department for Orthopaedic Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences (NDORMS), University of Oxford, Botnar Research Centre, Windmill Road, Oxford, UK

<sup>2</sup> Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre, Oxford University NHS Foundation Trust, Windmill Road, Oxford, UK

<sup>3</sup> Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, University of Leeds, Chapel Allerton Hospital, Chapeltown Road, Leeds LS7 4SA

**Conflicts of interest:** The author or one or more of the authors have received or will receive benefits for personal or professional use from a commercial party related directly or indirectly to the subject of this article. In addition, benefits have been or will be directed to a research fund, foundation, educational institution, or other non-profit organisation with which one or more of the authors are associated.

**Title:** The interaction of caseload and usage in determining outcomes of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: A meta-analysis

**Abstract**

**Background:** Outcomes following UKA are variable and influenced by surgical caseload (UKA/year) and usage (percentage of primary knee arthroplasty that are UKA), which relates to indications. This meta-analysis assesses the relative importance of these factors.

**Methods:** MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid) and the Web of Science (ISI) were searched for consecutive series of minimally invasive cemented Phase 3 Oxford medial UKA. The primary outcome measure was revision-rate/100 observed component years (%pa). Series were divided into groups according to caseload and usage.

**Results:** 46 studies, including 12,520 knees, were identified. The annual revision-rate varied from 0%pa to 4.35%pa, mean 1.21%pa (95%CI 0.97-1.47). In series with mean follow-up of ten-years or more the revision-rate was 0.63%pa (95%CI 0.46-0.83), which equates to a ten-year survival of 94% (95%CI 92%-95%). Aseptic loosening, lateral arthritis, bearing dislocation, and unexplained pain were the predominant failure mechanisms with revision for patello-femoral problems and polyethylene wear exceedingly rare (<0.1%).

Both increasing caseload ( $p=0.02$ ) and usage ( $p<0.001$ ) were associated with decreasing revision-rate. The lowest revision-rates were achieved with a caseload >24 UKA/year (0.88%pa, 95%CI 0.63-1.61) and usage >30% (0.69%pa, 95%CI 0.50-0.90). Usage was more important than caseload: with high-usage ( $\geq 20\%$ ) the revision-rate was low, whether the caseload was high (>12UKA/year) or low ( $\leq 12$ UKA/year), (0.94%pa (95%CI 0.69-1.23) and 0.85%pa (95%CI 0.65-1.08) respectively); whereas with low-usage (<20%) the revision-rate was high, whether the caseload was high or low (1.58%pa, 95%CI 0.57- 3.05 and 1.76%pa, 95%CI 1.21-2.41).

**Conclusion:** To achieve optimum results with mobile-bearing UKA surgeons, whether high or low-caseload, should adhere to the recommended indications such that  $\geq 20\%$ , or ideally >30% of

54 their knee replacements are UKA. If they do this then they can expect to achieve results similar  
55 to those of the long-term series, which all had high-usage (>20%) and an average ten-year  
56 survival of 94%.

57 **Level of Evidence:** Level 2

58 **Keywords:** Unicompartamental knee arthroplasty, implant survival, meta-analysis

## Introduction

In appropriate patients UKA has significant benefits over TKA including faster recovery, better patient reported outcome measures (PROMS) and lower morbidity and mortality, however, it has been reported to be associated with a higher incidence of failure[1]. The causes of failure are multi-factorial but involve a complex interaction of patient, implant and surgeon factors as well as differing thresholds for revision compared to TKA[2].

Surgeon factors associated with outcome include technical skills associated with the procedure itself as well as non-technical skills associated with decision-making around patient selection. Technical skills have been hypothesised to improve as surgical volume increases and in TKA it has been demonstrated that high-volume surgeons have lower procedure times, transfusion rates and inpatient stays which culminate in better PROMS[3]. Similar findings have been reported in UKA, albeit more marked than TKA, with a fourfold difference in revision rates seen between the lowest and highest-volume surgeons using joint registry data suggesting that UKA may be more sensitive to technical errors [4].

Non-technical skills associated with decision-making around patient selection are related to surgical indications. In severe osteoarthritis which fails non-operative treatments surgeons can choose between UKA and TKA. This decision relates to an individual surgeon's indications, which is reflected by the relative proportions of a surgeon's primary knee practice that receive UKA relative to TKA. In UKA it has been demonstrated that, within certain limits, surgeons who use broad indications, as assessed by a high proportion of patients receiving UKA, have lower revision rates compared to surgeons who use narrow indications. The indications for mobile-bearing UKA are satisfied in about 50% of knees needing replacement. With mobile-bearing UKA acceptable revision rates tend to be achieved by surgeons who use UKA for 20% or more of their knee replacements and optimal results are achieved in those who use UKA for about 50% of their knee replacements [5].

84 It has been reported that optimum outcomes following UKA are achieved either when a surgeon  
85 operates on high-volume of cases (high-caseload) or has a practice where a high-proportion of  
86 primary knee arthroplasties are UKA (high-usage)[4, 5]. The relative importance of each of these  
87 factors on implant survival following UKA has not been explored. At present it is unclear whether  
88 good outcomes can be achieved when a surgeon has a high-caseload but uses narrow indications  
89 such that they have low-usage, or vice versa where a surgeon has a low-caseload but implants  
90 UKA in high proportion of cases (high-usage). This is relevant with regards to the provision of  
91 UKA as a surgeon cannot change the volume of their practice but can change percentage of  
92 knees which can be UKA.

93 The objective of this meta-analysis is review the results of the Phase 3 cemented Oxford UKA, to  
94 determine the importance of caseload and usage of UKA on implant survival and mechanism of  
95 failure and to assess the interplay between these two factors.

96

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Search strategy and criteria**

MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid) and the Web of Science (ISI) were searched to identify studies reporting the outcomes of the cemented Phase 3 Oxford medial UKA (Zimmer Biomet, Warsaw, Indiana) implanted through a minimally invasive approach between 1998, the year the Phase 3 was introduced, and 17 March 2016. Appendix 1. In addition reference lists of included publications, published reviews, conference abstracts and experts in the field were contacted to identify additional reports.

Studies were excluded if they did not report the outcomes of a consecutive series of knees or did not present implant survival data. Registry studies were excluded due to the limitations in data reporting and obtaining volume and usage data for individual surgeons. There were no limits on language of publication, number of patients, duration of follow-up or indication.

Searches were performed in duplicate. All study authors were contacted to confirm the data extraction was correct and to determine caseload and usage of UKA. Figure 1.

### **Outcome measures assessed**

For each study the number of UKA, number of revisions, reason for revision, and mean follow-up were recorded in duplicate. In addition the caseload (UKA/surgeon/year) and usage (percentage of the surgeons primary knee practice that are UKA) of UKA was recorded and/or requested from authors. Quality of included studies was assessed using the Methodological Index for Non-Randomised Studies (MINORS) score[6].

### **Caseload: UKA per surgeon per year**

Surgical caseload was divided based according to clinically plausible cut-points a priori, based on the system employed by the New Zealand Joint Registry[7]. Surgeons performing  $\leq 6$ UKA/year were considered very low-caseload,  $>6$  and  $\leq 12$ UKA/year low-caseload,  $>12$  and  $\leq 24$ UKA/year medium-caseload and  $>24$ UKA/year high-caseload.

### **Usage: UKA as a proportion of all primary knee arthroplasty**

Very low-usage was defined as surgeons who performed  $<10\%$ UKA, low-usage  $\geq 10\%$  but  $<20\%$ UKA, medium-usage  $\geq 20\%$  but  $<30\%$ UKA and high-usage  $\geq 30\%$ .

### **Combined caseload and usage**

To explore the interaction between caseload and usage four groups were created based on: low-caseload ( $\leq 12$ UKA/year) and high-usage ( $\geq 20\%$ UKA), high-caseload ( $>12$ UKA/year) and high-usage ( $\geq 20\%$ UKA), low-caseload ( $\leq 12$ UKA/year) and low-usage group ( $<20\%$ UKA), and high-caseload ( $>12$ UKA/year) and low-usage group ( $<20\%$ UKA).

### **Statistical analysis**

The primary outcome was the all cause revision rate per 100 observed component years, which is otherwise known as the annual revision rate (%pa). This was calculated first by multiplying the number of knees by their mean follow up to determine the number of observed component years and then dividing the number of revisions observed by the number of component years and multiplying this by 100. As revisions for bearing dislocation occur early after the primary operation, and as such may not have a constant annual revision rate the absolute revision rate was calculated. Confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the Clopper-Pearson, exact,

method[8]. As revision rates were expected to be low a Freeman-Tukey variance stabilising double arcsine transformation was used such that studies with zero rates would not be excluded[9]. Where a difference in the primary outcome was detected secondary outcomes were assessed: including the annual revision rate for lateral compartment disease progression, bearing dislocation, unexplained pain and aseptic loosening as these have been reported to be the predominant failure mechanisms of mobile-bearing UKA[4]. In addition the rates of other potential causes of revision, including revision for disease progression in the patello-femoral joint, polyethylene wear and tibial fracture were assessed.

As revision rates follow a binomial distribution a meta-analysis of proportions was performed with summary annual revision rates pooled using a random effects model to minimize the effect of between-study heterogeneity[10, 11]. Statistical heterogeneity across studies was assessed using the  $I^2$  statistic[12].

Analysis was performed overall and based on those studies with long-term, mean 10-years or greater, outcomes with sub-group analysis based on caseload, usage and the interaction between caseload and usage as defined above. Analysis was conducted using Stata Version 13 (Stata Corp, Texas, USA) with a  $p < 0.05$  considered statistically significant.



## Results

Searches identified a total of 3585 papers with an additional five-studies identified. Figure 1. After screening, the full-texts of 83 studies were retrieved and assessed with 37 excluded (Appendix 2) leaving 46 (12,520 knees 67,128 component years) meeting inclusion criteria. Table 1. The mean MINORS score of included studies was 12 (range 10-14).

After contacting authors, data on the caseload was available for 37 studies (80%) and on usage for 34 studies (74%). Table 2. The smallest study, Palacios *et al.*, had 24 observed component years and reported no failures and was found to skew the revision estimate towards zero[13]. Therefore, as generally recommended, this study was excluded from the quantitative analysis[13]. The analysis was repeated including this study and this did not change the interpretation of the results.

The all cause revision rate was 1.21%pa (95%CI 0.97-1.47). Revision indications are outlined in Table 3. The revision rate for aseptic loosening was 0.19% pa (95%CI 0.09 to 0.32), for lateral compartment disease progression was 0.10% pa (95%CI 0.04 to 0.19), bearing dislocation 0.10% pa (95%CI 0.05 to 0.17) and unexplained pain 0.05% pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.11). Table 3. Out of the 12,520 knees there were 121 (0.97%) dislocations, 20 (0.16%) tibial plateau fracture, 7 (0.06%) revisions for patella-femoral disease and 1 (0.01%) revision for polyethylene wear secondary to anterior impingement. In series with long-term outcomes, mean follow-up 10-years or greater, the all cause revision rate was 0.63%pa (95%CI 0.46-0.83). Table 3 & 4.

### Caseload: UKA per surgeon per year

No difference in mean age ( $p=0.69$ ), gender ( $p=0.71$ ) or BMI ( $p=0.38$ ) was seen between groups based on caseload.

The revision rate decreased as the caseload increased ( $p=0.02$ ). Figure 2. The revision rate where surgeons performed:  $\leq 6$  UKA/year was 1.87%pa (95%CI 1.14-2.76),  $>6$  but  $\leq 12$  UKA/year was 1.25%pa (95%CI 0.77-1.83),  $>12$  but under  $\leq 24$  UKA/year was 1.37%pa (95%CI 0.93-1.89) and  $>24$  UKA/year was 0.88%pa (95%CI 0.63-1.61).

The revision rate for lateral compartment disease progression ( $p=0.005$ ), unexplained pain ( $p=0.02$ ) and aseptic loosening ( $p=0.003$ ) decreased as caseload increased. No difference in annual revision rate ( $p=0.58$ ) or absolute revision rate ( $p=0.17$ ) for bearing dislocation was detected. Table 3.

#### **Usage: UKA as a proportion of all primary knee arthroplasty**

As usage of UKA increased the mean age increased ( $p=0.04$ ). The mean age of patients in surgeons who performed UKA in  $<10\%$  of cases was 63.4 years (SD4.2) increasing to 69.4 years (SD4.3) in surgeons who implanted UKA in at  $\geq 30\%$  of cases. No difference in gender ( $p=0.27$ ) or BMI ( $p=0.32$ ) was seen.

The revision rate decreased as usage of UKA increased ( $p<0.001$ ). Figure 3. The revision rate in series where surgeons performed:  $<10\%$  UKA was 1.89%pa (95%CI 1.15-2.80),  $\geq 10\%$  but  $<20\%$  UKA was 1.48%pa (95%CI 0.91-2.18),  $\geq 20\%$  but  $<30\%$  UKA was 1.25%pa (95%CI 1.07-1.43) and  $\geq 30\%$  was 0.69%pa (95%CI 0.50-0.90).

The revision rate for unexplained pain ( $p=0.02$ ) and aseptic loosening ( $p=0.001$ ) decreased as the usage of UKA increased. No difference in annual revision rate ( $p=0.94$ ) or absolute revision rate ( $p=0.33$ ) for bearing dislocation, or annual revision rate for lateral compartment disease progression ( $p=0.10$ ) was seen. Table 3.

## Combined caseload and usage

No difference in mean age ( $p=0.84$ ), gender ( $p=0.73$ ) or BMI ( $p=0.19$ ) was seen based on the combined caseload and usage of UKA.

Significant differences in revision rate were seen between groups ( $p=0.004$ ) with lower revision rates seen where there was higher UKA usage. The revision rate was 0.85%pa (95%CI 0.65-1.08) in the low-caseload ( $\leq 12$  UKA/year) and high-usage group ( $\geq 20\%$  UKA) and 0.94%pa (95%CI 0.69-1.23) in the high-caseload ( $> 12$  UKA/year) and high-usage ( $\geq 20\%$  UKA) group compared to 1.76%pa (95%CI 1.21-2.41) in the low-caseload ( $\leq 12$  UKA/year) and low-usage group ( $< 20\%$  UKA) and 1.58%pa (95%CI 0.57-3.05) in the high-caseload ( $> 12$  UKA/year) and low-usage ( $< 20\%$  UKA) group. (With the Palacios *et al.* study included the revision rate in the low-caseload, high-usage group was 0.32%pa (95%CI 0.16-0.52)). Figure 4.

Significant differences in the revision rate for lateral compartment disease progression ( $p=0.002$ ), persistent pain ( $p=0.01$ ) and aseptic loosening ( $p=0.001$ ) were observed with the lowest revision rates seen in the high-caseload high usage series. No difference in annual revision rate ( $p=0.71$ ) or absolute risk of revision ( $p=0.71$ ) for bearing dislocation was detected. Table 3.

## Discussion

In published series of the cemented Phase 3 Oxford medial UKA (46 studies, 12,520 knees, 67,128 component years) the all cause revision rate was 1.21%pa (95%CI 0.97-1.47) falling to 0.63%pa (95%CI 0.46-0.83) in series with a mean follow-up of 10-years or greater. Table 3. Aseptic loosening, progression of disease in the lateral compartment, bearing dislocation, and unexplained pain represented the predominant failure mechanisms with revisions for patella-femoral joint disease (7 cases) and polyethylene wear (1 case) being exceedingly rare (<0.1%).

Revision rates decreased with both increasing surgeon caseload (UKA/surgeon/year) and usage (percentage of primary knee arthroplasty that are UKA). It is well recognised, and expected, that revision rate should decrease with increasing caseload[4]. It is however counterintuitive that it should increase with usage. Kozinn & Scott (1989) described the ideal indications for a UKA, and subsequent studies suggested that these were satisfied in about 5% of knee replacements [14-16]. Kozinn and Scott also suggested that with broader indications, and thus increased usage, the revision rate would increase. This meta-analysis is the first review of clinical studies that has shown that this is not the case, supporting analysis of Registry data, and concluding that the revision rate decreases with increased usage, at least for mobile-bearing UKA[5].

Usage was found to be more important than caseload: Usage was independent of caseload, with high-usage surgeons achieving equally good results regardless of their overall caseload, whereas caseload was not independent of usage. In low-usage surgeons the annual revision rate was almost double that of high-usage surgeons regardless of whether surgeons implanted a high number of UKA (high-caseload) or not (low-caseload). The results of this study therefore suggest that to achieve optimum outcomes mobile-bearing UKA should be performed in a high proportion of a surgeon's practice and suggests that surgeons who perform a low number of knee arthroplasties can still achieve good results provided that UKA is performed in an adequate proportion. There were no studies available for high usage, very low-caseload surgeons

( $<6$ UKA/year), and as such we cannot recommend that surgeons do such small numbers, even if their usage is acceptable.

As low-usage surgeons have a high revision rate, regardless of whether they have a low or high-caseload, the reasons for this are likely to be related to their indications for UKA, or possibly for revision of UKA, rather than their surgical technique. The primary indication for mobile-bearing UKA is antero-medial OA. This requires (a) medial bone-on-bone arthritis (b) functionally normal ACL (c) functionally normal MCL (d) full thickness lateral cartilage and (e) patellofemoral joint without lateral grooving and bone loss[17]. It has been demonstrated that around 50% of cases undergoing knee arthroplasty meet these criteria and that suitability for UKA can be identified pre-operatively using a structured radiographic assessment in combination with a radiographic Decision Aid[18]. It is striking that the lowest revision rate (0.69%pa) was achieved by those doing  $>30\%$  of their knee replacements as UKA, who were presumably adhering closely to the recommended indications.

Surgeons performing UKA in a low-proportion of cases and obtaining poor results are probably using inappropriate indications. Surgeons may be concerned that UKA will fail because of progression of disease in the retained compartments. Therefore they may only implant UKA if the retained compartments are pristine, which usually only occurs if there is early arthritis with partial thickness cartilage loss (PTCL) in the medial compartment. It is well known that patients with PTCL do not do well with TKA, so a mobile-bearing UKA may seem to be an ideal solution, as these patients tend to be young and active. However patients with PTCL also do badly with UKA and have worse outcomes compared to those with bone-on-bone anteromedial osteoarthritis[19, 20]. Whilst we can only speculate as to the reasons for failure, this study found that low-usage UKA surgeons operated on younger patients, and had revision rates for persistent pain that were ten-fold higher than high-usage surgeons, with both these features being associated with operating on knees with PTCL. Recent work has highlighted that around a quarter of young patients ( $<60$  years) undergoing arthroplasty are not suitable for UKA due to PTCL and it may be

that low usage surgeons are performing UKA in these patients and achieving poor results as a consequence[21]. Further work is required to confirm this finding, as well as to clarify the results of registry studies which have reported higher failure rates of UKA in young patients, a finding not observed in cases series performed for bone-on-bone arthritis [22-24].

A final consideration is that, the higher revision rate in low-usage surgeons may relate to their indications for revision. In this study low-usage surgeons had a higher revision rate due to aseptic loosening compared to high-usage surgeons. Aseptic loosening is typically identified radiographically by the presence of radiolucent lines around the prosthesis[25]. Following mobile-bearing UKA two types of tibial radiolucency are recognized: Physiological radiolucencies are common, occurring in two thirds of cases, and are non-progressive, narrow (<2mm) with well-defined sclerotic margins. They are not indicative or predictive of loosening nor are they a source of pain[26-28]. In contrast pathological radiolucencies are rare, progressive and poorly-defined and are suggestive of loosening or infection. It is likely that surgeons who have not learnt the correct indications for mobile-bearing UKA, and are therefore low-usage surgeons, have also not understood the relevance of these radiolucencies, and may be doing unnecessary revisions for physiological radiolucencies[29].

Whilst this study found a relationship between caseload and implant survival it was only the high-usage surgeons, >24 UKA/year, which appeared to have a lower failure rate. Figure 2. This result is different from previous studies which have reported a progressive decrease in failure rate with increasing caseload with revision rates in high-caseload series typically half to a quarter of that seen in low-caseload series[4, 30, 31]. One reason this relationship may not have been seen in this study is that in almost a quarter of the high-caseload studies included in this analysis were low-usage (4 of 17 studies), which we found to be associated with higher failure rate[29, 32-34] . In cross-sectional studies, because of the relationship between caseload and usage, we would expect the number of high-volume and low-usage UKA surgeons to be lower than seen in this

series[4]. As such usage may be a confounding variable that has not been accounted for in previous reports.

In series reporting the long-term outcomes (mean follow-up of 10-years or greater) of mobile-bearing UKA the survival rate was 94% (95%CI 92–95). Table 3. This result is better than the 10-year survival rate (88%, 95%CI 85-90) extrapolated from the annual revision rate for all series, which have, on average a shorter follow-up. One reason for this is that the annual revision rate tends to overestimate the long-term failure rate, particularly in studies with a high incidence of early failures and a short duration of follow-up. This is relevant to this study: firstly because with mobile-bearing UKA bearing dislocation tends to occur early, and secondly because many of the included studies represent the learning curve of the surgeons who may have more revisions during this period. However, the main reason why the revision rate of the 10-year series is lower than all series combined is that all the ten-year series were from high-usage surgeons, whereas the other series came from a mixture of low and high-usage surgeons with low-usage surgeons tending to get worse results. The main conclusion from this study is therefore that if surgeons want to use the mobile-bearing UKA they should use it for a high-proportion of their knee replacements ( $\geq 20\%$ ). If they do this they should expect to achieve a similarly good survival as seen in studies with long-term outcomes (94% ten-year survival).

There are limitations of this study: surgeons may over or understate their UKA caseload and usage, presenting a risk of recall bias. Due to limited information provided in published series it was not possible to evaluate functional outcomes which are critical in evaluating the optimum treatment. The study is based on published case series of UKA, which are open to publication bias. As the results of arthroplasty are expected to be good it may be easier to get poor results published early and these need only be based on small numbers of patients. In contrast it is difficult to get good results published, as these require large numbers of patients with long follow-up. Therefore a higher proportion of poor results may be published than good.

326

327

328 **Conclusion**

329 To achieve optimum results with mobile-bearing UKA surgeons should use it for at least 20%,  
330 and ideally 50% of their knee replacements. To do this they should adhere to the recommended  
331 indications. This effect appears to be independent of the caseload of UKA performed meaning  
332 that optimum results can still achieved by relatively low-volume surgeons (>6 and <12/year).  
333 Surgeons with optimal usage should be able to achieve a 10-year survival of about 94%.

334



**Acknowledgements:**

The authors would like to thank J. Brown and J. Ferris for their assistance with this study. TWH has been supported by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, based at Oxford University Hospitals Trust, Oxford. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health. Financial support has been received from Zimmer Biomet.

## References

1. 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*, 2014
2. Baker PN, Petheram T, Avery PJ, Gregg PJ, Deehan DJ. Revision for unexplained pain following unicompartmental and total knee replacement. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery American volume* 94(17): e126, 2012
3. Lau RL, Perruccio AV, Gandhi R, Mahomed NN. The role of surgeon volume on patient outcome in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review of the literature. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord* 13: 250, 2012
4. Liddle AD, Pandit H, Judge A, Murray DW. Effect of Surgical Caseload on Revision Rate Following Total and Unicompartmental Knee Replacement. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery-American Volume* 98A(1): 1, 2016
5. 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* 97-B(11): 1506, 2015
6. Slim K, Nini E, Forestier D, Kwiatkowski F, Panis Y, Chipponi J. Methodological index for non-randomized studies (minors): development and validation of a new instrument. *ANZ J Surg* 73(9): 712, 2003
7. New Zealand Joint Registry 16 Year Report, New Zealand Orthopaedic Association. In. 2015
8. Clopper CJ, Pearson ES. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika* 26(4): 404, 1934
9. Freeman MF, Tukey JW. Transformations related to the angular and the square root. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 21(4): 607, 1950
10. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 7(3): 177, 1986
11. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: a Stata command to perform meta-analysis of binomial data. *Arch Public Health* 72(1): 39, 2014
12. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327(7414): 557, 2003
13. Friedrich JO, Adhikari NK, Beyene J. Inclusion of zero total event trials in meta-analyses maintains analytic consistency and incorporates all available data. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 7: 5, 2007
14. Stern SH, Becker MW, Insall JN. Unicondylar knee arthroplasty. An evaluation of selection criteria. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* (286): 143, 1993
15. Ritter MA, Faris PM, Thong AE, Davis KE, Meding JB, Berend ME. Intra-operative findings in varus osteoarthritis of the knee. An analysis of pre-operative alignment in potential candidates for unicompartmental arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 86(1): 43, 2004
16. Kozinn SC, Scott R. Unicondylar knee arthroplasty. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 71(1): 145, 1989
17. Goodfellow JW, Kershaw CJ, Benson MK, O'Connor JJ. The Oxford Knee for unicompartmental osteoarthritis. The first 103 cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 70(5): 692, 1988
18. Hamilton TW, Pandit HG, Lombardi Jr AV, Adams JB, Oosthuizen CR, Clave A, Dodd CAF, Berend KR, Murray DW. Radiological Decision Aid to determine suitability for medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: Development and preliminary validation. *Bone Joint J* 98-B(10 Suppl B): 3, 2016
19. Pandit H, Gulati A, Jenkins C, Barker K, Price AJ, Dodd CA, Murray DW. Unicompartmental knee replacement for patients with partial thickness cartilage loss in the affected compartment. *Knee* 18(3): 168, 2011
20. Maier MW, Kuhs F, Streit MR, Schuhmacher P, Walker T, Ewerbeck V, Gotterbarm T. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in patients with full versus partial thickness cartilage loss (PTCL): equal in clinical outcome but with higher reoperation rate for patients with PTCL. *Archives of Orthopaedic & Trauma Surgery* 135(8): 1169, 2015

21. Hamilton TW, Pandit HG, Lombardi AV, Adams JB, Oosthuizen CR, Clave A, Dodd CA, Berend KR, Murray DW. Radiological Decision Aid to determine suitability for medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: development and preliminary validation. *Bone Joint J* 98-B(10 Supple B): 3, 2016
22. Berend KR, Lombardi AV, Jr., Adams JB. Obesity, young age, patellofemoral disease, and anterior knee pain: identifying the unicondylar arthroplasty patient in the United States. *Orthopedics* 30(5 Suppl): 19, 2007
23. Pandit H, Jenkins C, Gill HS, Smith G, Price AJ, Dodd CA, Murray DW. Unnecessary contraindications for mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 93(5): 622, 2011
24. van der List JP, Chawla H, Zuiderbaan HA, Pearle AD. The Role of Preoperative Patient Characteristics on Outcomes of Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis Critique. *J Arthroplasty*, 2016
25. Ritter MA, Zhou H, Keating CM, Keating EM, Faris PM, Meding JB, Berend ME. Radiological factors influencing femoral and acetabular failure in cemented Charnley total hip arthroplasties. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 81(6): 982, 1999
26. Tibrewal SB, Grant KA, Goodfellow JW. The radiolucent line beneath the tibial components of the Oxford meniscal knee. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 66(4): 523, 1984
27. Gulati A, Chau R, Pandit HG, Gray H, Price AJ, Dodd CA, Murray DW. The incidence of physiological radiolucency following Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement and its relationship to outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 91(7): 896, 2009
28. 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* 97-B(11): 1493, 2015
29. Schroer WC, Barnes CL, Diesfeld P, LeMarr A, Ingrassia R, Morton DJ, Reedy M. The Oxford unicompartmental knee fails at a high rate in a high-volume knee practice. *Clin Orthop* 471(11): 3533, 2013
30. Baker P, Jameson S, Critchley R, Reed M, Gregg P, Deehan D. Center and surgeon volume influence the revision rate following unicondylar knee replacement: an analysis of 23,400 medial cemented unicondylar knee replacements. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 95(8): 702, 2013
31. Robertsson O, Knutson K, Lewold S, Lidgren L. The routine of surgical management reduces failure after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume* 83(1): 45, 2001
32. Bhattacharya R, Scott CE, Morris HE, Wade F, Nutton RW. Survivorship and patient satisfaction of a fixed bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty incorporating an all-polyethylene tibial component. *Knee* 19(4): 348, 2012
33. Dervin GF, Carruthers C, Feibel RJ, Giachino AA, Kim PR, Thurston PR. Initial experience with the oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 26(2): 192, 2011
34. Munk S, Odgaard A, Madsen F, Dalsgaard J, Jorn LP, Langhoff O, Jepsen CF, Hansen TB. Preoperative lateral subluxation of the patella is a predictor of poor early outcome of Oxford phase-III medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Acta Orthopaedica* 82(5): 582, 2011
35. Akan B, Karagüven D, Guclu B, Yildirim T, Kaya A, Armangil M, Cetin I. Cemented versus Uncemented Oxford Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: Is There a Difference? *Adv Orthop* 2013: 245915, 2013
36. Amin AK, Patton JT, Cook RE, Gaston M, Brenkel IJ. Unicompartmental or total knee arthroplasty?: Results from a matched study. *Clin Orthop* 451: 101, 2006
37. Aslan H, Ersan O, Baz AB, Duman E, Aydin E, Ates Y. Midterm results of Oxford phase 3 unicondylar knee arthroplasty for medial osteoarthritis. [Turkish]. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 41 (5): 367, 2007
38. Bergeson AG, Berend KR, Lombardi AV, Jr., Hurst JM, Morris MJ, Sneller MA. Medial mobile bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: early survivorship and analysis of failures in 1000 consecutive cases. *J Arthroplasty* 28(9 Suppl): 172, 2013

39. Biau DJ, Greidanus NV, Garbuz DS, Masri BA. No difference in quality-of-life outcomes after mobile and fixed-bearing medial unicompartmental knee replacement. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 28(2): 220, 2013

40. Bottomley N, Jones LD, Rout R, Avland A, Rombach I, Evans T, Jackson WFM, Beard DJ, Price AJ. A survival analysis of 1084 knees of the Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Bone Joint J* 98-B(10 Suppl B): 22, 2016

41. Bozkurt M, Akmeser R, Cay N, Isik C, Bilgetekin YG, Kartal MG, Tecimel O. Cam impingement of the posterior femoral condyle in unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 21(11): 2495, 2013

42. Burnett RSJ, Nair R, Hall CA, Jacks DA, Pugh L, McAllister MM. Results of the Oxford Phase 3 mobile bearing medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty from an independent center: 467 knees at a mean 6-year follow-up: analysis of predictors of failure. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 29(9 Suppl): 193, 2014

43. Choy WS, Kim KJ, Lee SK, Yang DS, Lee NK. Mid-term results of oxford medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin 3 (3)*: 178, 2011

44. Cinar BM, Akpinar S, Uysal M, Cesur N, Hersekli MA, Ozalay M, Ozkoc G. [Unicondylar knee arthroplasty in medial unicompartmental osteoarthritis: technical faults and difficulties]. *Eklemler Hastalik Cerrahisi* 21(1): 31, 2010

45. Clarius M, Hauck C, Seeger JB, Pritsch M, Merle C, Aldinger PR. Correlation of positioning and clinical results in Oxford UKA. *International Orthopaedics* 34(8): 1145, 2010

46. Clark M, Campbell DG, Kiss G, Dobson PJ, Lewis PL. Reintervention after mobile-bearing Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop* 468(2): 576, 2010

47. Clement ND, Duckworth AD, MacKenzie SP, Nie YX, Tiemessen CH. Medium-term results of Oxford phase-3 medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *J* 20(2): 157, 2012

48. Cool S, Victor J, De Baets T. Does a minimally invasive approach affect positioning of components in unicompartmental knee arthroplasty? Early results with survivorship analysis. *Acta Orthopaedica Belgica* 72(6): 709, 2006

49. Edmondson M, Atrey A, East D, Ellens N, Miles K, Goddard R, Apthorp H, Butler-Manuel A. Survival analysis and functional outcome of the Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement up to 11 years follow up at a District General Hospital. *Journal of orthopaedics* 12(Suppl 1): S105, 2015

50. Edmondson MC, Isaac D, Wijeratna M, Brink S, Gibb P, Skinner P. Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: medial pain and functional outcome in the medium term. *J* 6: 52, 2011

51. Emerson Jr RH, Alnouchoukati O, Barrington J, Ennin K. The results of Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in the United States: A mean ten-year survival analysis. *Bone Joint J* 98-B(10 Suppl B): 34, 2016

52. Falcão P, Grenho A, Costa JH, Jorge JT, Arcângelo J, Catarino P. Artroplastia unicompartmental do joelho Oxford Knee phase 3: Resultados a médio prazo. *Revista Portuguesa de Ortopedia e Traumatologia* 22(3): 295, 2014

53. Faour-Martin O, Valverde-Garcia JA, Martin-Ferrero MA, Vega-Castrillo A, de la Red Gallego MA, Suarez de Puga CC, Amigo-Linares L. Oxford phase 3 unicondylar knee arthroplasty through a minimally invasive approach: long-term results. *Int Orthop* 37(5): 833, 2013

54. Heller S, Fenichel I, Salai M, Luria T, Velkes S. The Oxford unicompartmental knee prosthesis for the treatment of medial compartment knee disease: 2 to 5 year follow-up. *Israel Medical Association Journal: Imaj* 11(5): 266, 2009

55. Ingale PA, Hadden WA. A review of mobile bearing unicompartmental knee in patients aged 80 years or older and comparison with younger groups. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 28(2): 262, 2013

56. Ji JH, Park SE, Song IS, Kang H, Ha JY, Jeong JJ. Complications of medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Clin* 6(4): 365, 2014

57. Keys GW, Ul-Abiddin Z, Toh EM. Analysis of first forty Oxford medial unicompartmental knee replacement from a small district hospital in UK. *Knee* 11(5): 375, 2004

499 58. Kim KT, Lee S, Kim JH, Hong SW, Jung WS, Shin WS. The Survivorship and Clinical Results of Minimally  
 500 Invasive Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty at 10-Year Follow-up. *Clin* 7(2): 199, 2015  
 501 59. Kim S-J, Bae J-H, Lim HC. Factors affecting the postoperative limb alignment and clinical outcome after  
 502 Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 27(6): 1210, 2012  
 503 60. Kort NP, van Raay JJAM, Cheung J, Jolink C, Deutman R. Analysis of Oxford medial unicompartmental  
 504 knee replacement using the minimally invasive technique in patients aged 60 and above: an independent  
 505 prospective series. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 15(11): 1331, 2007  
 506 61. Kort NP, van Raay JJAM, van Horn JJ. The Oxford phase III unicompartmental knee replacement in  
 507 patients less than 60 years of age. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 15(4): 356, 2007  
 508 62. Kuipers BM, Kollen BJ, Bots PCK, Burger BJ, van Raay JJAM, Tulp NJA, Verheyen CCPM. Factors  
 509 associated with reduced early survival in the Oxford phase III medial unicompartment knee replacement.  
 510 *Knee* 17(1): 48, 2010  
 511 63. Lim HC, Bae JH, Song SH, Kim SJ. Oxford phase 3 unicompartmental knee replacement in Korean  
 512 patients. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 94(8): 1071, 2012  
 513 64. Lisowski LA, van den Bekerom MPJ, Pilot P, van Dijk CN, Lisowski AE. Oxford Phase 3 unicompartmental  
 514 knee arthroplasty: medium-term results of a minimally invasive surgical procedure. *Knee Surgery, Sports*  
 515 *Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 19(2): 277, 2011  
 516 65. Luscombe KL, Lim J, Jones PW, White SH. Minimally invasive Oxford medial unicompartmental knee  
 517 arthroplasty. A note of caution! *International Orthopaedics* 31(3): 321, 2007  
 518 66. Mallen TA, Diaz-Borjon E, Makdissy-Salomon GJ, Montejo-Vargas J, Marcial-Barba LD. [Medial  
 519 unicompartmental knee arthroplasty with a phase 3 Oxford prosthesis. Results with a 2 to 11 year follow-  
 520 up]. *Acta Ortopedica Mexicana* 28(3): 153, 2014  
 521 67. Matharu G, Robb C, Baloch K, Pynsent P. The Oxford medial unicompartmental knee replacement:  
 522 Survival and the affect of age and gender. *Knee* 19 (6): 913, 2012  
 523 68. Nerhus TK, Heir S, Svege I, Skramm I, Jervidalo T, Madsen JE, Ekeland A. Time-dependent improvement  
 524 in functional outcome following Oxford medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. A prospective  
 525 longitudinal multicenter study involving 96 patients. *Acta Orthopaedica* 83(1): 46, 2012  
 526 69. Palacios Blancarte F, Montes Samaniego F. Unicompartment knee arthroplasty with an Oxford  
 527 prosthesis. [Spanish]. *Acta ortopedica mexicana* 21 (2): 49, 2007  
 528 70. Parmaksizoglu AS, Kabukcuoglu Y, Ozkaya U, Bilgili F, Aslan A. Short-term results of the Oxford phase  
 529 3 unicompartmental knee arthroplasty for medial arthritis. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 44(2): 135, 2010  
 530 71. Petersen W, Metzlauff S, Forkel P, Achtnich A, Schmoranzner K, Hertel P. [Unicompartmental joint  
 531 (Oxford III) with mobile bearing : Minimally invasive implantation of a in the medial compartment]. *Oper*  
 532 *25(5): 505, 2013*  
 533 72. Smith TO, Clark A, Glasgow MMS, Donell ST. The mid-term clinical results of the phase 3 Oxford  
 534 unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: A 6- to 8-year follow-up. *Eur J Orthop Surg Tr* 22 (4): 307, 2012  
 535 73. Song M-H, Kim B-H, Ahn S-J, Yoo S-H, Lee M-S. Early complications after minimally invasive mobile-  
 536 bearing medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 24(8): 1281, 2009  
 537 74. Kristensen PW, Holm HA, Varnum C. Up to 10-year follow-up of the Oxford medial partial knee  
 538 arthroplasty--695 cases from a single institution. *J Arthroplasty* 28(9 Suppl): 195, 2013  
 539 75. Whittaker JP, Naudie DD, McAuley JP, McCalden RW, MacDonald SJ, Bourne RB. Does bearing design  
 540 influence midterm survivorship of unicompartmental arthroplasty? *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 468(1): 73, 2010  
 541 76. Yoshida K, Tada M, Yoshida H, Takei S, Fukuoka S, Nakamura H. Oxford phase 3 unicompartmental  
 542 knee arthroplasty in Japan - clinical results in greater than one thousand cases over ten years. *J*  
 543 *Arthroplasty* 28(9 Suppl): 168, 2013  
 544 77. Aldinger PR, Clarius M, Murray DW, Goodfellow JW, Breusch SJ. Medial unicompartmental knee  
 545 replacement using the "Oxford Uni" meniscal bearing knee. [German]. *Orthopade* 33 (11): 1277, 2004

546 78. Catani F, Benedetti MG, Bianchi L, Marchionni V, Giannini S, Leardini A. Muscle activity around the  
 547 knee and gait performance in unicompartmental knee arthroplasty patients: a comparative study on fixed-  
 548 and mobile-bearing designs. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 20(6): 1042, 2012  
 549 79. Chatellard R, Sauleau V, Colmar M, Robert H, Raynaud G, Brilhault J, Societe d'Orthopedie et de  
 550 Traumatologie de IO. Medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: does tibial component position  
 551 influence clinical outcomes and arthroplasty survival? *Orthopaedics & traumatology, surgery & research*  
 552 99(4 Suppl): S219, 2013  
 553 80. Daniilidis K, Skwara A, Skuginna A, Fischer F, Tibesku CO. [Comparison of medium-term clinical and  
 554 radiological outcome between cemented and cementless medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty].  
 555 *Zeitschrift fur Orthopadie & Unfallchirurgie* 147(2): 188, 2009  
 556 81. Emerson RH, Jr., Hansborough T, Reitman RD, Rosenfeldt W, Higgins LL. Comparison of a mobile with  
 557 a fixed-bearing unicompartmental knee implant. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* (404): 62, 2002  
 558 82. Emerson RH, Jr., Higgins LL. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty with the oxford prosthesis in  
 559 patients with medial compartment arthritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 90(1): 118, 2008  
 560 83. Gleeson RE, Evans R, Ackroyd CE, Webb J, Newman JH. Fixed or mobile bearing unicompartmental  
 561 knee replacement? A comparative cohort study. *Knee* 11(5): 379, 2004  
 562 84. Hooper N, Snell D, Hooper G, Maxwell R, Frampton C. The five-year radiological results of the  
 563 uncemented Oxford medial compartment knee arthroplasty. *Bone & Joint Journal* 97-B(10): 1358, 2015  
 564 85. Jahromi I, Walton NP, Dobson PJ, Lewis PL, Campbell DG. Patient-perceived outcome measures  
 565 following unicompartmental knee arthroplasty with mini-incision. *International Orthopaedics* 28(5): 286,  
 566 2004  
 567 86. Kaczmarczyk J, Nowakowski A, Balcerkiewicz K, Stanek R. Treatment of degenerative disease of knee  
 568 joint with the Oxford prosthesis. [Polish]. *Chir Narzadow Ruchu Ortop Pol* 68 (3): 173, 2003  
 569 87. Kendrick BJ, Kaptein BL, Valstar ER, Gill HS, Jackson WF, Dodd CA, Price AJ, Murray DW. Cemented  
 570 versus cementless Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty using radiostereometric analysis: a  
 571 randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint J* 97-B(2): 185, 2015  
 572 88. Kubat P, Ptacek Z. Biomechanical parameters and clinical outcomes of the Oxford Phase III  
 573 unicompartmental knee replacement. [Czech, English]. *Acta Chirurgiae Orthopaedicae et Traumatologiae*  
 574 *Cechoslovaca* 78 (4): 367, 2011  
 575 89. Langdown AJ, Pandit H, Price AJ, Dodd CA, Murray DW, Svard UC, Gibbons CL. Oxford medial  
 576 unicompartmental arthroplasty for focal spontaneous osteonecrosis of the knee. *Acta Orthop* 76(5): 688,  
 577 2005  
 578 90. Li MG, Yao F, Joss B, Ioppolo J, Nivbrant B, Wood D. Mobile vs. fixed bearing unicompartmental knee  
 579 arthroplasty: A randomized study on short term clinical outcomes and knee kinematics. *Knee* 13(5): 365,  
 580 2006  
 581 91. Liddle AD, Pandit H, Murray DW, Dodd CA. Cementless unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Orthop Clin*  
 582 *North Am* 44(3): 261, 2013  
 583 92. Ma T, Cai M-w, Xue H-m, Liu X-d, Tu Y-h. [Pre-operative assessment of the patellofemoral joint in  
 584 unicompartmental knee replacement using Oxford Phase III and its influence on outcome]. *Chung Hua*  
 585 *Wai Ko Tsa Chih* 51(11): 1010, 2013  
 586 93. Mascitti T, Lastroni G, Valsecchi L, Fracassetti A. The Oxford III prosthesis: Evolution of the technique  
 587 and outcome reproducibility. [Italian]. *Minerva Ortopedica e Traumatologica* 56 (4): 251, 2005  
 588 94. Masri BA, Bourque J, Patil S. Outcome of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in patients receiving  
 589 worker's compensation. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 24(3): 444, 2009  
 590 95. Mercier N, Wimsey S, Saragaglia D. Long-term clinical results of the Oxford medial unicompartmental  
 591 knee arthroplasty. *International Orthopaedics* 34(8): 1137, 2010  
 592 96. Mullaji AB, Shetty GM, Kanna R. Postoperative limb alignment and its determinants after minimally  
 593 invasive Oxford medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty* 26(6): 919, 2011

97. Muller PE, Pellengahr C, Witt M, Kircher J, Refior HJ, Jansson V. Influence of minimally invasive surgery on implant positioning and the functional outcome for medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Arthroplasty* 19(3): 296, 2004
98. Nassiri M, Quinlan JF, O'Byrne JM. Analysis of 13 early failures of the mobile bearing Oxford phase III unicompartmental knee prosthesis. *Eur J Orthop Surg Tr* 20(4): 303, 2010
99. Pandit H, Liddle AD, Kendrick BJ, Jenkins C, Price AJ, Gill HS, Dodd CA, Murray DW. Improved fixation in cementless unicompartmental knee replacement: five-year results of a randomized controlled trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am* 95(15): 1365, 2013
100. Pandit HG, Campi S, Hamilton TW, Dada OD, Pollalis S, Jenkins C, Dodd CA, Murray DW. Five-year experience of cementless Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 2015
101. Parratte S, Pauly V, Aubaniac JM, Argenson JNA. No long-term difference between fixed and mobile medial unicompartmental arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat R* 470 (1): 61, 2012
102. Pietschmann MF, Weber P, Steinbrueck A, Wohlleb L, Jansson V, Mueller PE. Experience with medial unicompartmental prostheses with a mobile plateau. *Orthopade* 43(10): 905, 2014
103. Rajasekhar C, Das S, Smith A. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. 2- to 12-year results in a community hospital. *Journal of Bone & Joint Surgery - British Volume* 86(7): 983, 2004
104. Shakespeare D, Waite J. The Oxford Medial Partial Knee Replacement. The rationale for a femur first technique. *Knee* 19(6): 927, 2012
105. Skowronski J, Jatskewych J, Dlugosz J, Skowronski R, Bielecki M. The Oxford II medial unicompartmental knee replacement. A minimum 10-year follow-up study. *Ortopedia Traumatologia Rehabilitacja* 7 (6): 620, 2005
106. Streit MR, Streit J, Walker T, Bruckner T, Philippe Kretzer J, Ewerbeck V, Merle C, Aldinger PR, Gotterbarm T. Minimally invasive Oxford medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in young patients. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*, 2015
107. Sun PF, Jia YH. Mobile bearing UKA compared to fixed bearing TKA: A randomized prospective study. *Knee* 19 (2): 103, 2012
108. Tang H, Zhao L, Yan H, Jin D, Su X. [Mid-term effectiveness of Oxford Unicompartmental Knee System Phase III for medial unicompartmental knee osteoarthritis]. [Chinese]. *Zhongguo xiu fu chong jian wai ke za zhi* = *Zhongguo xiufu chongjian waikexue zazhi* = Chinese journal of reparative and reconstructive surgery 26 (1): 17, 2012
109. Tuncay I, Bilsel K, Elmadag M, Erkocak OF, Asci M, Sen C. Evaluation of mobile bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty, opening wedge, and dome-type high tibial osteotomies for knee arthritis. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc* 49(3): 280, 2015
110. Verdonk R, Cottenie D, Almqvist KF, Vorlat P. The Oxford unicompartmental knee prosthesis: a 2-14 year follow-up. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 13(3): 163, 2005
111. Vorlat P, Putzeys G, Cottenie D, Van Isacker T, Pouliart N, Handelberg F, Casteleyn PP, Gheysen F, Verdonk R. The Oxford unicompartmental knee prosthesis: An independent 10-year survival analysis. *Knee Surgery, Sports Traumatology, Arthroscopy* 14 (1): 40, 2006
112. White SH, Roberts S, Jones PW. The Twin Peg Oxford partial knee replacement: The first 100 cases. *Knee* 19 (1): 36, 2012
113. Zermatten P, Munzinger U. The Oxford II medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: an independent 10-year survival study. *Acta Orthopaedica Belgica* 78(2): 203, 2012

638 **Table 1: Demographic Information of included studies**

Study	Country	Age	Age range	% male	BMI	BMI range	MINORS Score
Akan 2013[35]	Turkey	64	42 - 84	17	29.8	19 – 42	11
Amin 2006[36]	UK	68	40 - 91	50	29.2	21 – 43	13
Aslan 2007[37]	Turkey	57	47 - 73	11	NS		11
Bergeson 2013[38]	USA	63	29 - 91	44	32.2	17 – 58	11
Bhattacharya 2012[32]	UK	69	50 - 83	50	NS		12
Biau 2013[39]	Canada	60	55 - 65	33	32.0	29 – 34	11
Bottomley 2016[40]	UK	67		49	NS		12
Bozkurt 2013[41]	Turkey	57		NS	NS		11
Burnett 2014[42]	Canada	69	40 - 88	44	29.7	18 – 49	14
Choy 2011[43]	South Korea	65	44 - 82	10	NS		12
Cinar 2010[44]	Turkey	58	44 - 76	8	NS		11
Clarius 2010[45]	Germany	63	45 - 78	49	29.0	20 – 42	13
Clark 2010[46]	Australia	64	45 - 81	NS	NS		11
Clement 2012[47]	UK	70		43	NS		12
Cool 2006[48]	Belgium	66	45 - 90	29	27.5		12
Davidson 2013[49]	UK	65	41 - 87	51	NS		10
Dervin 2011[33]	Canada	65	38 - 89	43	30.1	19 – 53	11
Edmondson 2011[50]	UK	67	57 - 86	NS	NS		11
Emerson 2016[51]	USA	67	38 - 89	55	29.9	17 – 62	13
Falcao 2014[52]	Portugal	64	49 - 78	15	NS		11
Faour-Martin 2013[53]	Spain	59		29	27.1		12
Heller 2009[54]	Israel	63	45 - 80	32	NS		11
Ingale 2013[55]	UK	67	42 - 92	NS	29.3		12
Ji 2014[56]	South Korea	64	50 - 76	15	NS		11
Keys 2013[57]	UK	69	40 - 87	NS	NS		13
Kim KT 2015[58]	South Korea	62	45 - 75	NS	NS		12
Kim SJ 2012[59]	South Korea	67	49 - 79	19	NS		14
Kort 2007[60, 61]	The Netherlands	66	43 - 93	34	30.7		11
Kuipers 2010[62]	The Netherlands	63	39 - 85	32	NS		11
Lim 2012[63]	South Korea	69	48 - 82	NS	NS		13
Lisowski 2011[64]	The Netherlands	73	43 - 91	NS	28.0	19 – 52	12
Luscombe 2007[65]	UK	63	41 - 79	NS	28.4		11
Mallen 2014[66]	Mexico	71	57 - 81	16	28.1	19 – 36	11
Matharu 2012[67]	UK	63	35 - 87	NS	NS		11
Munk 2011[34]	Denmark	66		51	NS		11
Nerhus 2012[68]	Norway	65	51 - 80	41	NS		11
Palacios 2007[69]	Mexico	NS	55 - 74	32	NS		10
Pandit 2015[28]	UK	66	32 - 88	48	NS		13
Parmaksizoglu 2012[70]	Turkey	67	56 - 75	26	NS		10
Petersen 2013[71]	Germany	71	59 - 79	NS	NS		11
Schroer 2013[29]	USA	57	40 - 76	58	NS		12
Smith 2012[72]	UK	67		NS	NS		11
Song 2009[73]	South Korea	66	57 - 82	7	NS		11
Wagner-Kristensen 2013[74]	Denmark	64	30 - 94	NS	NS		12
Whittaker 2010[75]	Canada	63	49 - 87	NS	30.7	19.3 - 43.1	10
Yoshida 2013[76]	Japan	77	47 - 94	18	NS		13

NS: Not stated.



**Table 2: Details of included studies**

Study	Number of knees	Number of patients	Mean follow-up (years)	Follow-up range (years)	Number of revisions	Caseload (UKA/surgeon/year)	Usage (% UKA)
Akan 2013[35]	141	120	3.5	2.0 - 4.3	10	21	NS
Amin 2006[36]	54	54	4.9	2.0 - 5.9	6	NS	NS
Aslan 2007[37]	27	27	2.3	2.0 - 3.0	2	NS	NS
Bergeson 2013[38]	839	688	3.7	0.1 - 6.5	40	111	22
Bhattacharya 2012[32]	49	44	5.6	2.0 - 9.9	1	15	5
Biau 2013[39]	37	33	5.3	4.9 - 6.3	1	12	8
Bottomley 2016[40]	1084	947	5.2		46	8	50
Bozkurt 2013[41]	53	NS	1.2	0.5 - 3.3	1	NS	15
Burnett 2014[42]	467	387	6.1	0.7 - 11.6	42	6	13
Choy 2011[43]	188	166	6.7	4.7 - 8.6	17	48	34
Cinar 2010[44]	41	40	1.6	0.8 - 3.5	1	NS	8
Clarius 2010[45]	61	59	5.0	4.0 - 7.0	2	3	13
Clark 2010[46]	398	398	3.6	1.0 - 8.5	15	11	20
Clement 2012[47]	49	49	7.2		4	12	13
Cool 2006[48]	50	49	3.7	2.6 - 5.0	3	NS	NS
Davidson 2013[49]	699	699	4.2		39	54	27
Dervin 2011[33]	545	545	3.8	2.3 - 7.4	32	18	17
Edmondson 2011[50]	48	48	4.5	3.0 - 6.0	4	6	6
Emerson 2016[51]	213	173	10.0	4.0 - 11.0	20	85	40
Falcao 2014[52]	29	27	3.9	0.8 - 6.9	2	NS	NS
Faour-Martin 2013[53]	511	402	10.4		29	85	NS
Heller 2009[54]	59	59	2.7		7	7	5
Ingale 2013[55]	470	NS	3.9		29	5	9
Ji 2014[56]	246	245	2.8	1.0 - 8.0	20	16	NS
Keys 2013[57]	107	NS	11.5		6	24	31
Kim KT 2015[58]	166	128	10.0		16	83	23
Kim SJ 2012[59]	124	104	6.7	4.2 - 9.1	3	40	NS
Kort 2007[60, 61]	200	175	4.0	2.0 - 7.0	19	8	4
Kuipers 2010[62]	437	437	2.6	0.1 - 7.9	45	5	10
Lim 2012[63]	400	320	5.2	1.0 - 10.0	14	44	30
Lisowski 2011[64]	244	216	4.2	1.0 - 10.4	9	27	40
Luscombe 2007[65]	78	68	2.0		4	23	22
Mallen 2014[66]	30	25	6.1	1.1 - 11.5	3	3	
Matharu 2012[67]	459	392	4.4	0.5 - 11.2	23	8	18
Munk 2011[34]	268	268	1.0		3	19	15
Nerhus 2012[68]	99	96	2.0		6		
Palacios 2007[69]	24	22	1.0	0.7 - 3.0	0	6	33
Pandit 2015[28]	1000	818	10.3	5.3 - 16.6	52	50	70
Parmaksizoglu 2012[70]	38	38	2.0	1.5 - 2.7	0	NS	NS
Petersen 2013[71]	50	NS	5.0		3		NS
Schroer 2013[29]	83	77	3.6	0.3 - 7.1	13	28	7
Smith 2012[72]	230	NS	7.3		21	19	23
Song 2009[73]	100	94	9.0		9	43	23
Wagner-Kristensen 2013[74]	695	579	4.6	0.0 - 10.7	51	24	22
Whittaker 2010 [75]	79	62	3.6	1.0 - 11.3	7	5	7
Yoshida 2013[76]	1251	990	5.2	1.0 - 10.5	25	114	70

644

**Table 3: Indications for revision**

645

	<b>All Cause</b>	<b>Aseptic Loosening</b>	<b>Lateral Progression</b>	<b>Bearing Dislocation</b>	<b>Unexplained Pain</b>
<b>All series</b>	1.21%pa (95%CI 0.97 to 1.47)	0.19%pa (95%CI 0.09 to 0.32)	0.10%pa (95%CI 0.04 to 0.19)	0.10%pa (95%CI 0.05 to 0.17)	0.05%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.11)
<b>Caseload</b>					
≤6 UKA pa	1.87%pa (95%CI 1.14 to 2.76)	0.36%pa (95%CI 0.15 to 0.64)	0.59%pa (95%CI 0.35 to 0.87)	0.08%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.19)	0.19%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.60)
>24 UKA pa	0.88%pa (95%CI 0.63 to 1.61)	0.07%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.19)	0.15%pa (95%CI 0.04 to 0.32)	0.21%pa (95%CI 0.10 to 0.35)	0.03%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.09)
<i>p</i> -value	<b>0.02</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.005</b>	0.58	<b>0.02</b>
<b>Usage</b>					
<10%	1.89%pa (95%CI 1.15 to 2.80)	0.65%pa (95%CI 0.17 to 1.36)	0.19%pa (95%CI 0.05 to 0.39)	0.04%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.18)	0.22%pa (95%CI 0.02 to 0.57)
≥30%	0.69%pa (95%CI 0.50 to 0.90)	0.09%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.22)	0.12%pa (95%CI 0.03 to 0.26)	0.17%pa (95%CI 0.07 to 0.15)	0.02%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.12)
<i>p</i> -value	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>0.001</b>	0.10	0.94	<b>0.02</b>
<b>Combined</b>					
Low caseload, Low usage	1.76%pa (95%CI 1.21 to 2.41)	0.56%pa (95%CI 0.34 to 0.82)	0.23%pa (95%CI 0.08 to 0.44)	0.08%pa (95%CI 0.02 to 0.17)	0.28%pa (95%CI 0.07 to 0.58)
High caseload, Low usage	1.58%pa (95%CI 0.57 to 3.05)	0.62%pa (95%CI 0 to 2.17)	0.58%pa (95%CI 0.31 to 0.91)	0.06%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.23)	0.09%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.27)
Low caseload, High usage	0.85%pa (95%CI 0.65 to 1.08)	0.23%pa (95%CI 0.13 to 0.36)	0.24 (95%CI 0.14 to 0.38)	0.12%pa (95%CI 0.05 to 0.22)	0.06%pa (95%CI 0.01 to 0.13)
High caseload, High usage	0.94%pa (95%CI 0.69 to 1.23)	0.16%pa (95%CI 0.05 to 0.31)	0.12%pa (95%CI 0.04 to 0.25)	0.18%pa (95%CI 0.08 to 0.30)	0.04%pa (95%CI 0 to 0.11)
<i>p</i> -value	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.002</b>	0.71	<b>0.01</b>

646

647 **Table 4: Studies with mean follow-up of 10 years or greater**

Study	Number of knees	Annual revision rate (%pa)	Annual revision rate 95% CI (%pa)	10y survival (%)	10y survival (%) 95% CI	Caseload (UKA/surgeon/year)	Usage (% UKA)
Emerson 2016[51]	213	0.94	0.57 – 1.45	90.6	85.5 – 94.3	85	40
Faour-Martin 2013[53]	511	0.55	0.37 – 0.78	94.5	92.2 – 96.3	85	NS
Keys 2013[57]	107	0.49	0.18 – 1.06	95.1	89.4 – 98.2	24	31
Kim KT 2015[58]	166	0.96	0.55 – 1.56	90.4	84.4 – 94.5	83	23
Pandit 2015[28]	1000	0.50	0.38 – 0.66	95.0	93.4 – 96.2	50	70
<b>OVERALL</b>		0.63	0.46 – 0.83	93.7	91.7 – 95.4		

648

649

650 **Appendix 1**

- 651 1. Arthroplasty, Replacement, Knee/  
 652 2. Partial.ab  
 653 3. unicompartmental.ab  
 654 4. unicondylar.ab  
 655 5. uni.ab  
 656 6. UKA.ab  
 657 7. UKR.ab  
 658 8. UCA.ab  
 659 9. UCR.ab  
 660 10. PKA.ab  
 661 11. PKR.ab  
 662 12. PCA.ab  
 663 13. Oxford.ab  
 664 14. meniscal.ab  
 665 15. mobile.ab  
 666 16. OR/ 2-15  
 667 17. 1 AND 16  
 668 18. 17 (limited to humans)  
 669

Database searched	Date searched	Number of results
MEDLINE (OVID) & in Process 1946 to March 16, 2016	17/03/2016	1554
EMBASE (OVID) 1996 to Week 11 2016	17/03/2016	975
ISI Web of Science (SCI, SSCI, CPCI-S & CPCI-SSH) searched to 20/01/15	17/03/2016	1056
<b>Total</b>		<b>3585</b>

670

671

## Appendix 2: Excluded studies

Study	Country	Reason excluded
Aldinger 2004[77]	Germany	No survival data
Catani 2012[78]	Italy	No survival data
Chatellard 2013[79]	France	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Daniilidis 2009[80]	Germany	No survival data
Emerson 2002[81]	USA	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Emerson 2008[82]	USA	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Gleeson 2004[83]	UK	Non-consecutive patients
Hooper 2015[84]	New Zealand	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Jahromi 2004[85]	Australia	No survival data
Kaczmarczyk 2003[86]	Poland	No survival data
Kendrick 2015[87]	UK	No survival data
Kubat 2011[88]	Czech Republic	No survival data
Langdown 2005[89]	UK	Non-consecutive patients
Li 2006[90]	Australia	Non-consecutive patients
Liddle 2013[91]	UK	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Ma 2013[92]	China	No survival data
Mascitti 2005 [93]	Italy	No survival data
Masri 2009[94]	Canada	Non-consecutive patients
Mercier 2010[95]	France	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Mullaji 2011[96]	India	No survival data
Muller 2004[97]	Germany	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Nassiri 2010[98]	Ireland	Non-consecutive patients
Pandit 2013[99]	UK	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Pandit 2015[100]	UK	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Parratte 2012[101]	France	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Pietschmann 2014[102]	Germany	No survival data
Rajasekhar 2004 [103]	UK	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Shakespeare 2012[104]	UK	No survival data
Skowronski 2005[105]	Poland	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Streit 2015[106]	Germany	Non-consecutive patients
Sun 2012[107]	China	Non-consecutive patients
Tang 2012[108]	China	No survival data
Tuncay 2015[109]	Turkey	Non-consecutive patients
Verdonk 2005[110]	Belgium	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Volpin 2006	Israel	No survival data
Vorlat 2006[111]	Belgium	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
White 2012[112]	UK	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3
Zermatten 2012[113]	Switzerland	Not cemented Oxford Phase 3