Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

Evidence Report/Technology Assessment

Number 86

Total Knee Replacement

Summary

Introduction

Total knee arthroplasty is one of the most common orthopaedic procedures performed. In 2001 171,335 primary knee replacements and 16,895 revisions were performed.[1] Throughout this report we use the term total knee arthroplasty (TKA) in lieu of total knee replacement because the abbreviation for the latter may be readily confused with total knee revision. Because these procedures are elective and expensive (Medicare paid approximately $3.2 billion in 2000 for hip and knee joint replacements) and because the prevalence of arthritis is expected to grow substantially as the population ages,[2, 3] these procedures are likely to come under increasing scrutiny.

Previous reports suggest that TKAs improve functional status, relieve pain, and result in relatively low perioperative morbidity.[4] However, based on conclusions from consensus panels or surveys of health care providers, there is considerable disagreement about the indications for the procedure; that is, which patients are most likely to benefit from TKA and, conversely, in which patients is TKA contraindicated or of low value.[5-10] This evidence report, which was commissioned for an NIH Consensus Development Conference on Total Knee Replacement, was designed to systematically review, analyze, and discuss empirical data on Total Knee Replacement, to help inform the deliberations of the Consensus Panel.

In collaboration with the Office of Medical Applications of Research (OMAR), the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases (NIAMS), and the TKR Planning Committee, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) defined the work to be performed for a comprehensive evidence report on the indications for primary TKR and revisions. The scope of the project specified that it address the following key questions regarding total knee arthroplasty:

1. What are the current indications for, and outcomes from, primary total knee replacement?
2. How do specific characteristics of the patient, material and design of the prosthesis, and surgical factors, affect the short-term and long-term outcomes of primary total knee replacement?
3. Are there important perioperative interventions that influence outcomes?
4. What are the indications, approaches, and outcomes for revision total knee replacement?
5. What factors explain disparities in the utilization of total knee replacement in different populations?
6. What are the directions for future research?

Methods

Literature Review and Meta-Analysis

To address the first key question about the indications and outcomes of TKAs, the National Library of Medicine staff conducted a systematic literature review from 1995 to April 2003.

The titles and abstracts of the resulting 3,519 references were then screened, using our inclusion criteria (primary total knee arthroplasty studies; more than 100 knees per study; baseline data and

post-op outcomes data provided; experimental or quasi-experimental study design, English language, tricompartment).

All articles that appeared to meet the screening criteria were abstracted by trained abstractors. Of the original results, 611 references either met the inclusion criteria or needed further screening of the full article to determine if they met inclusion. Of these, 62 studies reported pre- and post-TKA functional data using at least one of the four established measures we relied on (Knee Society score, Hospital for Special Surgery score, WOMAC, or SF-36).[11-74] All but 15 studies were conducted in the United States or Canada.

One of the problems that made summarizing this area difficult was the inconsistent use of patients and knees as the unit of analysis. The reason for this practice is related to the performance of bilateral procedures, either simultaneously or sequentially, but the result is an inconsistent count. Some studies provide both units; some only one. For some types of analysis knees seem like the best measure, but for many (including function and demographics) the data apply more reasonably to patients. Wherever feasible, we present the analysis using both patients and knees.

To address key question 2 regarding prosthesis material/design or surgical factors we analyzed studies that fell within our original search parameters. We attempted to classify a study as primarily addressing either the use of a specific type of prosthesis or testing a specific surgical procedure or technique. Specific characteristics of the patient that may affect outcomes are addressed as noted in the main analyses and reported under "Outcomes of Primary TKA."

We limited our analysis of evidence to assess important perioperative interventions that influence outcomes (key question 3) to studies published since 1994. All were randomized controlled studies with the exception of one large cohort study. We categorized interventions as: prophylaxis for postoperative deep venous thrombosis/pulmonary embolism or infection. Several other procedures involved non-surgical elements of care.

We conducted a meta-analysis on the functional outcomes data. Because the data at baseline and followup was not consistent, we selected the model with random effects to simplify the interpretation. Because we did not have precise information from all studies, we treated each pre and post pair as if they were separate data sets.

In addressing key question 4, about the outcomes of TKA revisions, we relied heavily on the meta-analysis recently completed by one of the principals, which covered the period from 1966 through 2000.[75] To update this meta-analysis, a literature search was undertaken to assess the status of the literature relating to revision total knee arthroplasty after (and including) the year 2000. The literature search was done via PubMed® using a strategy based on the search described in the previously published meta-analysis; 14 new studies were uncovered.[76-89]

To answer key question 5, about the evidence for access differences (disparities in utilization) related to race and gender, we conducted a literature search via PubMed from 1995 to 2003. This search resulted in 176 references. Titles and abstracts of the references were reviewed, and 23 met preliminary inclusion criteria (primary total knee arthroplasty studies; more than 100 knees per study; gender/racial data provided; experimental or quasi-experimental design). Of these, three met inclusion criteria for analysis.[90-95] Additionally, reference lists from the above articles, and from articles recommended by colleagues, were searched. Three additional articles were found and included in the analysis.

Results

Outcomes of Primary TKAs

On average the patients were approximately 70 years of age and very few of them were over age 85; about two-thirds were female; about one-third were considered obese (using a criterion of a BMI of 30 or higher). Nearly 90 percent of patients had osteoarthritis. We did not specifically address bilateral TKAs but did separate analyses by numbers of knees and numbers of patients.

The most commonly used functional measures were the Knee Society score (KS)[96] and the Hospital for Special Surgery scale (HSS).[97, 98] The WOMAC (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities) Arthritis Scale has only been used since 1991. The physical function component of the SF-36 is a generic functional outcomes measure, not specific to knees.

The KS is associated with longer followup periods, perhaps because it was in use earlier. For example, weighting for baseline patients the mean followup for KS and HSS is 66 and 67 months, compared to 45 months for WOMAC. However, weighting for baseline knees, KS has a mean followup of 90 months and WOMAC is 68 months, but HSS is only 61 months. The longest mean followup time was 90 months (KS scores weighted for baseline knees), well less than the 10 years that has been suggested in order to evaluate long term functional results. Only ten studies had a followup time of at least 10 years.

Some information on attrition rate was reported for 49 studies. Of these the median percentage of subjects lost to followup was 2 percent, the range was 0-28 percent. If death is added to the definition, the range increases to 0-56 percent with a median of 12 percent.

Although there is no formal basis for translating the size of the scores, the generally accepted rule of thumb for the KS and HSS scales is that a score of less than 60 is considered poor; 60-69 represents a fair result; 70-84 is considered a good result; 85-100 is considered an excellent result.

The functional scores after TKA are consistently higher. The mean effect size (defined as the number of standard deviations of change from baseline scores) for the HSS studies is 3.91 for those with followup up to 2 years, 3.01 for those 2-5 years, and 2.97 for those studies with more than 5 years of followup. For the studies using KS the mean effect size is 2.35 for those 0-2 years, 2.73 for those 2-5 years, and 2.67 for those 5+ years. For WOMAC studies the mean effect size for 0-2 years of followup is 1.62. The more generic SF-36 scores had the smallest mean effect size; for the studies with 0-2 years of followup it was 1.27.

When the unit of analysis was numbers of knees operated on, the perioperative complication rate (defined as occurring within 6 months of the TKA) was 5.4 percent; when the denominator was numbers of patients, the rate was 7.6 percent. The revision rate through 5 or more years is 2.0 percent of knees and 2.1 percent of patients.

We differentiated "indications for TKA" from "correlates or factors related to outcomes." The former addresses what factors are needed to warrant a TKA (or conversely, what factors are contraindications to TKA either because the procedure is ineffective, unnecessary, or places the patient at unacceptably high perioperative risk); whereas the latter addresses whether outcomes vary according to the clinical or demographic factors. To address indicators would require a design that compared the outcomes of persons with the potential indicator with and without surgical treatment. However, it is possible to examine the potential for contraindications by examining only those who receive arthroplasties.

The number of studies that employed any analytic technique examining the functional outcome in terms of at least one independent variable of interest was limited. Only 12 of the 69 studies used any analysis that directly assessed the relationship of these patient variables to a change in functional status.[22, 23, 25, 28, 32-34, 37, 43, 64, 70] Age, obesity, or gender do not seem to be significantly correlated with TKA outcomes. Whether outcomes vary according to arthritis type is unclear. Patients with rheumatoid arthritis seem to show more improvement than those with osteoarthritis but they have lower level of function preoperatively and few studies adjust for other risk factors such as obesity.

Types of Prostheses and/or Surgical Factors

Although the sampling approach was not specifically designed to search for all outcomes associated with using different types of prostheses or different surgical approaches, we did analyze the studies that fell within the search parameters. In some cases it was difficult to classify a study as primarily addressing either the use of a specific type of prosthesis or testing a specific surgical procedure or technique. Several studies reported prostheses that were used in specific types of procedures. A number of the studies of prostheses were case series that reported generally good results. A few tested the use of a prosthesis with a specific group of patients. The studies of procedures were a mixture of case studies and comparative studies.

Perioperative Interventions

TKA studies assessing prophylaxis for postoperative deep venous thrombosis (DVT) or infection were identified by searching the 611 references meeting and not meeting inclusion criteria. The Cochrane Library was also searched back to 1994. The investigators decided a priori to include only randomized controlled trials (RCTs) with the exception of large cohort studies. Fourteen studies were identified and extracted; nine DVT, three infection, and two tourniquet studies. All included studies were randomized controlled trials with the exception of one large cohort study.[99] One trial was identified through the Cochrane Library.[100]

Several other procedures, which involved primarily non-surgical elements of care, were also described. Three of these addressed the use of continuous passive motion as a rehabilitative approach; two studies were positive. The other two studies tested different clinical pathways and showed mixed results.

The review of randomized trials addressing prevention of venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolus uncovered several studies that tested various approaches to anticoagulation and other preventive techniques. Two studies suggest that compression ultrasonography is not justified. Two find drug therapy better than mechanical approaches. Several studies compared anticoagulant drugs and drug regimens.

Three randomized trials addressed infection prevention. Each compared alternative antibiotic regimens. Two randomized trials tested the use of tourniquets in performing TKAs. One concluded tourniquets were safe and the other that they did not reduce surgical complications.

Access

Six studies addressed TKA-related access issues according to race or gender.[90-95] Several of these studies included both hip and knee replacement surgery. The conclusions with regard to the differential treatment of women are mixed, but the preponderance of evidence suggests that women are almost twice as likely to undergo a TKA as men. The evidence regarding non-white groups is quite consistent. Non-whites receive TKAs about half as often as whites. Most of these analyses report simply the rate at which the procedures were performed, with no attention to the actual size or nature of the population at risk. The argument that the higher rates of TKAs in women may be due to the higher prevalence of arthritis among women does not apply to the study by Wilson, which examined only persons with arthritis. However, it is possible that the severity or type of arthritis (OA vs. RA) varied.

Conversely, the lower rates of TKAs among blacks occurred despite a higher prevalence of osteoarthritis in this group, suggesting that the prevalence of OA was not a mitigating factor. Most of the studies that address access relied on large administrative data sets, which did not contain detailed clinical data on which to base the indications for knee surgery.

Total Knee Arthroplasty Revisions

Like all biomedical devices, total knee replacements can fail over time. The primary factors believed to cause TKA failures (and thus require consideration for TKA revision-TKAR) include trauma, chronic progressive joint disease, prosthetic loosening, and infection of the prosthetic joint. Coincident with the increased incidence of primary TKA, there has also been an increase in the number of TKAR procedures.

The primary assessment of the outcomes of TKAR for this report is derived from a systematic review of the literature published through 2000 that was done by one of the principals. It used a global knee score (GKS) measure that included the HSS and the KS, each assessed along the same range from 0-100.

There was a large improvement in GKS scores following TKAR that was both statistically and clinically significant. The preoperative combined mean KS score was 35.4 (95% CI 30.7-39.9). There was an increase of 30.8 (95% CI 26.6-35.0) points to 66.2 (95% CI 61.8-70.2) points postoperatively ($p < 0.0001$). The preoperative mean HSS score was 51.5 (95% percent CI 48.9-54.1). There was an increase of 28.3 (95% CI 25.3-31.2) points to 79.8 (95% CI 76.4-83.1) points postoperatively ($p < 0.0001$).

Although there was no difference in age or gender between the multiple and single knee reports, there was a significant difference in preoperative HSS. Patients undergoing "multiple knee TKAR" had lower preoperative scores (multiple knee HSS = 49.5, 95% CI 45.9-53.2; single knee = 54.5, 95% CI 51.4-57.5; $p < 0.1$). These results suggest that the multiple knee cohorts may have more severe disease then subjects evaluated in single knee TKAR studies. In contrast, the preoperative combined mean KS score in the multiple knees group was higher (77.0, 95% CI 64.2-89.8) than the single knee group (59.85, 95% CI 45.2,-4.5), $p > 0.1$. There was no difference in the pooled change in either the KS or HSS from pre- and postoperative scores when comparing subjects undergoing multiple vs. single TKAR.

Forty-four of 46 (95.7 percent) cohorts reported complication data on 1683 subjects who incurred 443 complications (26.3 percent). It was not possible to determine which or how many complications occurred in any given patient or patient subset. There were a total of 217 knee complications in 1,683 subjects necessitating re-revision (12.9 percent).

Discussion

The basic observations can be summarized as follows:

- Both TKA and TKAR are associated with improved function. The strongest evidence exists over a followup period of up to two years, but the studies that extend to 5 and even 10 years of followup show positive results as well.
- The average age of patients undergoing TKA in these reports was 70 years with few over age 85. Two-thirds were female, one third were considered obese, and nearly 90 percent had osteoarthritis. No studies provided data on racial/ethnic status.
- The mean effect size (expressed as numbers of standard deviations) is considered large in magnitude and varies from 1.6 to 3.9 depending on the functional measure used and the duration of followup.
- There is no evidence that age, gender, or obesity is a strong predictor of functional outcomes.
- Patients with rheumatoid arthritis show more improvement than those with osteoarthritis, but this may be related to their poorer functional scores at the time of treatment and hence the potential for more improvement.
- The revision rate through five or more years is 2.0 percent of knees and 2.1 percent of patients.
- Perioperative complications as defined by the investigator occurred in 5.4 percent of patients and 7.6 percent of knees. The vast majority were "knee related" or deep venous thrombosis. There were only 8 cardiovascular or pulmonary complications reported among nearly 6,000 patients suggesting that these adverse effects were not fully addressed in this literature.
- There is reason to suspect selection effects in both the type of patients referred for TKA and those being reported in the literature as well as the attrition on followup. Hence, these findings must be interpreted with caution as the basis for clinical practice.
- TKA revisions show a similarly positive functional effect (with the same design limitations).

These conclusions are tempered by the limitations of the designs of many studies included in the analysis. Although osteoarthritis does not seem to be a predictor of outcomes, the results seem to be somewhat better for rheumatoid arthritis, but few of these studies simultaneously controlled for other aspects of the patients.

Overall, the scientific quality of the current evidence is weak. Only a handful of studies employed any form of multivariate analysis. The outcomes of orthopaedic surgery, like most other treatments, are the results of the treatments interacting with the characteristics of the patients. Real understanding will come about only when the analytic techniques can address both sets of variables simultaneously. The analyses that come from such studies will need to employ sophisticated statistical methods,

which can examine the effects of the patient characteristics on the outcomes of interest. Orthopaedic outcomes research has made considerable strides in the last decade. Much greater attention is now paid to using established outcomes measures. The next step in this progress is to employ more sophisticated research designs that incorporate patient characteristics into the analysis.

Because orthopaedic research will likely rely heavily on observational studies instead of RCTs, it will be important to use more robust methods of study design/analysis. Particular attention must be paid to ensuring that the cohorts remain intact. Greater efforts must be made to collect outcomes information on all participants, not just those who appear for followup visits. A substantial proportion of the studies reviewed were based on retrospective reviews of clinical records. Strong levels of evidence will require prospective designs that emphasize followup.

Research Recommendations

The current state of empirical work does not provide a strong basis for making clinical recommendations regarding indications for outcomes from TKA. As pressures mount for more discrimination in identifying subjects for elective surgery, better information will be needed. The ideal study design to answer questions about indications for surgery remains a randomized trial in which persons with advanced arthritis (or other potential joint problems) are randomly assigned to medical management or joint replacement. However, given the enthusiasm for joint replacement and the generally positive effects on function, it might be difficult to recruit subjects for such RCTs, even without the prospect of sham surgery. Thus, a major component of research into the effectiveness of joint replacement and the patient characteristics associated with better outcomes will be well done observational studies.

More attention needs to be paid to the independent variables (or risk factors) associated with clinically relevant outcomes. Adequate research designs will require the use of multivariate analysis. To generate the sample size needed for multivariate analysis, these studies will likely have to be cooperative ventures. Such a plan would also broaden their representation. They will require systematic collection of data on potential indicators and risk factors and active followup to maintain the cohort, even when the patients do not return for scheduled followup clinical visits.

Although many questions remain unanswered, a few major issues need to be addressed first:

- How long will the functional benefits of TKA last and when will revision surgery likely be needed?
- How much do outcomes vary by patient characteristics and surgical factors, including volume of these procedures performed? Is the volume effect related to the surgeon or the medical center? There is strong belief that volume of surgery in a center, and perhaps experience of the surgeon, is related to better outcomes, but the strength of this relationship has not yet been well established and may be artifactual.

Many of the basic questions posed for this review remain unanswered, such as:

- What are the effects of patient characteristics on outcomes?
- What is the effect of surgical technique on outcomes?
- How does the choice of prosthesis affect outcomes?
- What is the role of rehabilitation in affecting outcomes?

Availability of the Full Report

The full evidence report from which this summary was taken was prepared for the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) by the Minnesota Evidence-based Practice Center, Minneapolis, MN, under Contract No. 290-02-0009. It is expected to be available in December 2003. At that time, printed copies may be obtained free of charge from the AHRQ Publications Clearinghouse by calling 800-358-9295. Requesters should ask for Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 86, *Total Knee Replacement*. In addition, Internet users will be able to access the report and this summary online through AHRQ's Web site at www.ahrq.gov.

References

1. Orthopedic Network News. 2002 hip and knee implant review. CMS MedPar. Available at: www.OrthopedicNetworkNews.com. Accessed 9/8/03.
2. Acheson RM, Collart AB. New Haven survey of joint diseases. XVII. Relationship between some systemic characteristics and osteoarthrosis in a general population. Ann Rheum Dis 1975;34(5):379-87.
3. Peyron JG. Osteoarthritis. The epidemiologic viewpoint. Clin Orthop 1986;213:13-9.
4. Callahan CM, Drake BG, Heck DA, et al. Patient outcomes following tricompartmental total knee replacement. A meta-analysis postoperative alignment of total knee replacement. Its effect on survival. JAMA 1994;271(17):1349-57.
5. Tierney WM, Fitzgerald JF, Heck D, et al. Tricompartmental knee replacement: A comparison of orthopaedic surgeons' self reported performance rates with surgical indications, intraindications, and expected outcomes. Clin Ortho 1994;305:209-17.
6. Wright JG, Coyte P, Hawker G, et al. Variation in orthopedic surgeons' perceptions for and outcomes of knee replacement. Can Med Assoc J 1995;152:687-97.
7. Mancuso CA, Ranawat CS, Esdaile JM, et al. Indications for total hip and total knee arthroplasties. Results of orthopaedic surveys. J Arthroplasty 1996;11(1):34-46.
8. Coyte PC, Hawker G, Croxford R, et al. Variation in rheumatologists' and family physicians' perceptions of the indications for and outcomes of knee replacement surgery. J Rheumatol 1996;23(4):730-8.
9. Wright JG, Hawker GA, Bombardier C, et al. Physician enthusiasm as an explanation for area variation in the utilization of knee replacement surgery. Med Care 1999;37(9):946-56.

10. Malmlin LA, Melfi CA, Parchman ML, et al. Management of osteoarthritis of the knee by primary care physicians. Arch Fam Med 1998;7:563-7.
11. Bachmeier C, March L, Cross M, et al. A comparison of outcomes in osteoarthritis patients undergoing total hip and knee replacement surgery. Osteoarthritis Cartilage 2001;9(2):137-46.
12. Baldwin J, Rubinstein RJ. The effect of bone quality on the outcome of ingrowth total knee arthroplasty. Am J Knee Surg 1996;9(2):45-9; discussion 9-50.
13. Beaupre L, Davies D, Jones C, et al. Exercise combined with continuous passive motion or slider board therapy compared with exercise only: a randomized controlled trial of patients following total knee arthroplasty. Phys Ther 2001;81(4):1029-37.
14. Bert J, Gross M, Kline C. Patient demand matching in total knee arthroplasty: is it necessary? Am J Knee Surg 2001;14(1):39-42.
15. Bert J, Gross M, Kline C. Outcome results after total knee arthroplasty: does the patient's physical and mental health improve? Am J Knee Surg 2000;13(4):223-7.
16. Bourne R, Rorabeck C, Vaz M, et al. Resurfacing versus not resurfacing the patella during total knee replacement. Clin Orthop 1995;(321):156-61.
17. Brown T, Diduch D, Moskal J. Component size asymmetry in bilateral total knee arthroplasty. Am J Knee Surg 2001;14(2):81-4.
18. Bullens P, van Loon C, de Waal Malefijt M, et al. Patient satisfaction after total knee arthroplasty: a comparison between subjective and objective outcome assessments. J Arthroplasty 2001;16(6):740-7.
19. Saleh KJ, Radosevich DM, Kassim RA, et al. Comparison of commonly used orthopaedic outcome measures using palm-top computers and paper surveys. J Orthop Res 2002;20(6):1146-51.
20. Cloutier J, Sabouret P, Deghrar A. Total knee arthroplasty with retention of both cruciate ligaments. A 9 to 11 year follow-up study. Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol 2001;11(1):41-6.
21. Cohen R, Forrest C, Benjamin J. Safety and efficacy of bilateral total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 1997;12(5):497-502.
22. Deshmukh R, Hayes J, Pinder I. Does body weight influence outcome after total knee arthroplasty? A 1-year analysis. J Arthroplasty 2002;17(3):315-9.
23. Diduch D, Insall J, Scott W, et al. Total knee replacement in young, active patients. Long-term follow-up and functional outcome. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1997;79(4):575-82.
24. Duffy G, Berry D, Rand J. Cement versus cementless fixation in total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 1998; (356):66-72.
25. Elke R, Meier G, Warnke K, et al. Outcome analysis of total knee-replacements in patients with rheumatoid arthritis versus osteoarthritis. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 1995;114(6):330-4.
26. Evanich C, Tkach T, von Glinski S, et al. 6- to 10-year experience using countersunk metal-backed patellas. J Arthroplasty 1997;12(2):149-54.
27. Ewald F, Wright R, Poss R, et al. Kinematic total knee arthroplasty: a 10- to 14-year prospective follow-up review. J Arthroplasty 1999;14(4):473-80.
28. Fortin P, Clarke A, Joseph L, et al. Outcomes of total hip and knee replacement: preoperative functional status predicts outcomes at six months after surgery. Arthritis Rheum 1999;42(8):1722-8.
29. Gill G, Joshi A. Long-term results of cemented, posterior cruciate ligament-retaining total knee arthroplasty in osteoarthritis. Am J Knee Surg 2001;14(4):209-14.
30. Gill G, Joshi A, Mills D. Total condylar knee arthroplasty. 16- to 21-year results. Clin Orthop 1999;(367):210-5.
31. Gioe T, Bowman K. A randomized comparison of all-polyethylene and metal-backed tibial components. Clin Orthop 2000;(380):108-15.
32. Griffin F, Scuderi G, Insall J, et al. Total knee arthroplasty in patients who were obese with 10 years followup. Clin Orthop 1998;(356):28-33.
33. Harwin S. Patellofemoral complications in symmetrical total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 1998;13(7):753-62.
34. Hawker G, Wright J, Coyte P, et al. Health-related quality of life after knee replacement. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1998;80(2):163-73.
35. Hasegawa M, Ohashi T, Uchida A. Heterotopic ossification around distal femur after total knee arthroplasty. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 2002;122(5):274-8.
36. Healy W, Iorio R, Ko J, et al. Impact of cost reduction programs on short-term patient outcome and hospital cost of total knee arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2002;84-A(3):348-53.
37. Heck D, Robinson R, Partridge C, et al. Patient outcomes after knee replacement. Clin Orthop 1998;(356):93-110.
38. Hsu R, Tsai Y, Huang T, et al. Hybrid total knee arthroplasty: a 3- to 6-year outcome analysis. J Formos Med Assoc 1998;97(6):410-5.
39. Hube R, Sotereanos N, Reichel H. The midvastus approach for total knee arthroplasty. Orthop Traumatol 2002;10(3):235-44.
40. Ikejiani C, Leighton R, Petrie D. Comparison of patellar resurfacing versus nonresurfacing in total knee arthroplasty. Can J Surg 2000;43(1):35-8.
41. Indelli P, Aglietti P, Buzzi R, et al. The Insall-Burstein II prosthesis: A 5- to 9-year follow-up study in osteoarthritic knees. J Arthroplasty 2002;17(5):544-9.
42. Jenny J, Jenny G. Preservation of anterior cruciate ligament in total knee arthroplasty. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 1998;118(3):145-8.
43. Jones CA, Voaklander DC, Johnston DW, et al. The effect of age on pain, function, and quality of life after total hip and knee arthroplasty. Arch Intern Med 2001;161(3):454-60.
44. Jordan L, Olivo J, Voorhorst P. Survivorship analysis of cementless meniscal bearing total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 1997;(338):119-23.
45. Kiebzak G, Campbell M, Mauerhan D. The SF-36 general health status survey documents the burden of osteoarthritis and the benefits of total joint arthroplasty: But why should we use it? Am J Managed Care 2002;8(5):463-74.
46. Konig A, Kirschner S, Walther M, et al. Hybrid total knee arthroplasty. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg 1998;118(1-2):66-9.
47. Konig A, Scheidler M, Rader C, et al. The need for a dual rating system in total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 1997 Dec;(345):161-7.
48. Larson C, McDowell C, Lachiewicz P. One-peg versus three-peg patella component fixation in total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2001 Nov;(392):94-100.
49. Lin Y, Su J, Lin G, et al. Impact of a clinical pathway for total knee arthroplasty. Kaohsiung J Med Sci 2002;18(3):134-40.
50. Liu T, Chen S. Simultaneous bilateral total knee arthroplasty in a single procedure. Int Orthop 1998;22(6):390-3.
51. Lombardi Jr A, Mallory T, Fada R, et al. An algorithm for the posterior cruciate ligament in total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2001;(392):75-87.
52. Malkani A, Rand J, Bryan R, et al. Total knee arthroplasty with the kinematic condylar prosthesis. A ten-year follow-up study. J Bone Jt Surg Am 1995;77(3):423-31.

53. Martin S, McManus J, Scott R, et al. Press-fit condylar total knee arthroplasty. 5- to 9-year follow-up evaluation. J Arthroplasty 1997;12(6):603-14.
54. Matsueda M, Gustilo R. Subvastus and medial parapatellar approaches in total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2000;(371):161-8.
55. Meding J, Ritter M, Faris P, et al. Does the preoperative radiographic degree of osteoarthritis correlate to results in primary total knee arthroplasty? J Arthroplasty 2001;16(1):13-6.
56. Miyasaka K, Ranawat C, Mullaji A. 10- to 20-year followup of total knee arthroplasty for valgus deformities. Clin Orthop 1997;(345):29-37.
57. Mokris J, Smith S, Anderson S. Primary total knee arthroplasty using the Genesis Total Knee Arthroplasty System: 3- to 6-year follow-up study of 105 knees. J Arthroplasty 1997;12(1):91-8.
58. Mont M, Yoon T, Krackow K, et al. Eliminating patellofemoral complications in total knee arthroplasty: clinical and radiographic results of 121 consecutive cases using the Duracon system. J Arthroplasty 1999;14(4):446-55.
59. Moskal J, Diduch D. Postoperative radiographs after total knee arthroplasty: a cost-containment strategy. Am J Knee Surg 1998;11(2):89-93.
60. O'Rourke M, Callaghan J, Goetz D, et al. Osteolysis associated with a cemented modular posterior-cruciate-substituting total knee design : five to eight-year follow-up. J Bone Jt Surg Am 2002;84-A(8):1362-71.
61. Pereira D, Jaffe F, Ortiguera C. Posterior cruciate ligament-sparing versus posterior cruciate ligament-sacrificing arthroplasty. Functional results using the same prosthesis. J Arthroplasty 1998;13(2):138-44.
62. Ranawat C, Luessenhop C, Rodriguez J. The press-fit condylar modular total knee system. Four-to-six-year results with a posterior-cruciate-substituting design. J Bone Jt Surg Am 1997;79(3):342-8.
63. Rand J, Gustilo B. Comparison of inset and resurfacing patellar prostheses in total knee arthroplasty. Acta Orthop Belg 1996;62 (Suppl 1):154-63.
64. Regner L, Carlsson L, Karrholm J, et al. Clinical and radiologic survivorship of cementless tibial components fixed with finned polyethylene pegs. J Arthroplasty 1997;12(7):751-8.
65. Rinta-Kiikka I, Savilahti S, Pajamaki J, et al. A five to seven years follow-up of 102 cementless Synatomic knee arthroplasties. Ann Chir Gynaecol 1996;85(1):77-85.
66. Ritter M, Worland R, Saliski J, et al. Flat-on-flat, nonconstrained, compression molded polyethylene total knee replacement. Clin Orthop 1995; Dec(321):79-85.
67. Rodriguez J, Saddler S, Edelman S, et al. Long-term results of total knee arthroplasty in class 3 and 4 rheumatoid arthritis. J Arthroplasty 1996;11(2):141-5.
68. Schroder H, Berthelsen A, Hassani G, et al. Cementless porous-coated total knee arthroplasty: 10-year results in a consecutive series. J Arthroplasty 2001;16(5):559-67.
69. Sextro G, Berry D, Rand J. Total knee arthroplasty using cruciate-retaining kinematic condylar prosthesis. Clin Orthop 2001 Jul;388:33-40.
70. Stickles B, Phillips L, Brox W, et al. Defining the relationship between obesity and total joint arthroplasty. Obes Res 2001;9(3):219-23.
71. Title C, Rodriguez J, Ranawat C. Posterior cruciate-sacrificing versus posterior cruciate-substituting total knee arthroplasty: a study of clinical and functional outcomes in matched patients. J Arthroplasty 2001;16(4):409-14.
72. Ververeli P, Sutton D, Hearn S, et al. Continuous passive motion after total knee arthroplasty. Analysis of cost and benefits. Clin Orthop 1995 Dec;(321):208-15.
73. Worland R, Arredondo J, Angles F, et al. Home continuous passive motion machine versus professional physical therapy following total knee replacement. J Arthroplasty 1998;13(7):784-7.
74. Yang K, Yeo S, Lee B, et al. Total knee arthroplasty in diabetic patients: a study of 109 consecutive cases. J Arthroplasty 2001;16(1):102-6.
75. Saleh KJ, Dykes DC, Tweedie RL, et al. Functional outcome after total knee arthroplasty revision: a meta-analysis. J Arthroplasty 2002;17(8):967-77.
76. Gofton WT, Tsigaras H, Butler RA, et al. Revision total knee arthroplasty: fixation with modular stems. Clin Orthop 2002;(404):158-68.
77. Nazarian DG, Mehta S, Booth Jr RE. A comparison of stemmed and unstemmed components in revision knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2002;(404):256-62.
78. Brooks DH, Fehring TK, Griffin WL, et al. Polyethylene exchange only for prosthetic knee instability. Clin Orthop 2002;(405):182-8.
79. Springer BD, Hanssen AD, Sim FH, et al. The kinematic rotating hinge prosthesis for complex knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2001;(392):283-91.
80. Benjamin J, Engh G, Parsley B, et al. Morselized bone grafting of defects in revision total knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2001;(392):62-7.
81. Parvizi J, Seel MJ, Hanssen AD, et al. Patellar component resection arthroplasty for the severely compromised patella. Clin Orthop 2002;(397):356-61.
82. Lonner JH, Lotke PA, Kim J, et al. Impaction grafting and wire mesh for uncontained defects in revision knee arthroplasty. Clin Orthop 2002;(404):145-51.
83. Jones RE, Skedros JG, Chan AJ, et al. Total knee arthroplasty using the S-ROM mobile-bearing hinge prosthesis. J Arthroplasty 2001;16(3):279-87.
84. Christensen CP, Crawford JJ, Olin MD, et al. Revision of the stiff total knee arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty 2002;17(4):409-15.
85. Hanssen AD. Bone-grafting for severe patellar bone loss during revision knee arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2001;83-A(2):171-6.
86. Babis GC, Trousdale RT, Morrey BF. The effectiveness of isolated tibial insert exchange in revision total knee arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2002;84-A(1):64-8.
87. Leopold SS, Silverton CD, Barden RM, et al. Isolated revision of the patellar component in total knee arthroplasty. J Bone Joint Surg Am 2003;85-A(1):41-7.
88. Miller M, Benjamin JB, Marson B, et al. The effect of implant constraint on results of conversion of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty to total knee arthroplasty. Orthopedics 2002;25(12):1353-7; discussion 7.
89. Werle JR, Goodman SB, Imrie SN. Revision total knee arthroplasty using large distal femoral augments for severe metaphyseal bone deficiency: a preliminary study. Orthopedics 2002;25(3):325-7.
90. Dunlop DD, Song J, Manheim LM, et al. Racial disparities in joint replacement use among older adults. Med Care 2003;41(2):288-98.
91. Wilson MG, May DS, Kelly JJ. Racial differences in the use of total knee arthroplasty for osteoarthritis among older Americans. Ethn Dis 1994;4(1):57-67.
92. Escarce JJ, Epstein KR, Colby DC, et al. Racial differences in the elderly's use of medical procedures and diagnostic tests. Am J Public Health 1993;83(7):948-54.
93. Katz B, Freund D, Heck D, et al. Demographic variation in the rate of knee replacement: a multi-year analysis. Health Serv Res 1996;31(2):125-40.

94. Hawker GA, Wright JG, Coyte PC, et al. Differences between men and women in the rate of use of hip and knee arthroplasty.[comment]. N Engl J Med 2000;342(14):1016-22.
95. McBean AM, Gornick M. Differences by race in the rates of procedures performed in hospitals for Medicare beneficiaries. Health Care Financ Rev 1994 Summer;15(4):77-90.
96. Insall JN, Dorr LD, Scott RD, et al. Rationale of the Knee Society clinical rating system. Clin Orthop 1989 Nov;(248):13-4.
97. Alicea J. Scoring systems and their validation for the arthritic knee. In: Insall JN, Churchill SN, eds. Surgery of the Knee. 3rd ed. New York: Livingston; 2001:1507-15.
98. Bellamy N, Buchanan WW, Goldsmith CH, et al. Validation study of WOMAC: A health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. J Rheumatol 1988;15(12):1833-40.
99. Leclere JR, Gent M, Hirst J, et al. The incidence of symptomatic venous thromboembolism during and after prophylaxis with enoxaparin: a multi-institutional cohort study of patients who underwent hip or knee arthroplasty. Canadian Collaborative Group. Arch Intern Med 1998; 158(8):873-8.
100. Mauerhan DR, Nelson CL, Smith DL, et al. Prophylaxis against infection in total joint arthroplasty. One day of cefuroxime compared with three days of cefazolin. J Bone Joint Surg Am 1994 Jan; 76(1):39-45.

Suggested Citation

Kane RL, Saleh KJ, Wilt TJ, Bershadsky B, Cross WW III, MacDonald RM, Rutks I. Total Knee Replacement. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment No. 86 (Prepared by Minnesota Evidence-based Practice Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota). AHRQ Publication No. 04-E006-1. Rockville, MD: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. November 2003.

www.ahrq.gov
AHRQ Pub. No. 04-E006-1
December 2003

ISSN 1530-440X