



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

The Journal of Arthroplasty

journal homepage: www.arthroplastyjournal.org

World Expert Meeting in Arthroplasty 2024

Is There a Difference in Clinical Outcomes Between Fixed Bearing and Mobile Bearing Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty?

Fatih Yildiz, MD ^{a,*}, Mustafa Alper Incesoy, MD ^a, Efrain Diaz Borjon, MD ^b, Mustafa Senyurt, MD ^a, Neil Sheth, MD ^c, Abtin Alvand, MD ^d^a Department of Orthopedics, Bezmialem Vakif University Faculty of Medicine, Istanbul, Turkey^b Department of Joint Surgery, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México the National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico^c Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, University of Pennsylvania, Perelman School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania^d Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 18 September 2024

Received in revised form

8 October 2024

Accepted 8 October 2024

Available online 18 October 2024

Keywords:

unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (UKA)

fixed-bearing (FB)

mobile-bearing (MB)

outcomes

umbrella review

systematic review

Question: Is there a difference in clinical outcomes between fixed-bearing (FB) and mobile-bearing (MB) unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (UKA)?**Response/Recommendation:** Fixed-bearing and MB implants provide similar clinical outcomes after medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (mUKA).**Level of Evidence:** Low.**Delegate Vote:** Agree: 67.8%, Disagree: 21.5%, and Abstain: 10.8%.

Rationale

There are numerous recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses in the literature comparing the outcomes of fixed-bearing (FB) and mobile-bearing (MB) implants in medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty (mUKA).

We conducted an umbrella review to synthesize evidence from the systematic reviews and meta-analyses to determine if there is a difference in outcomes of FB and MB designs. The study protocol was registered in the International Prospective Register of

Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) (CRD42024532054). PubMed, Ovid MEDLINE, Cochrane Library, and CINAHL were searched for potentially eligible studies from data inception to April 20, 2024. The study focused only on the systematic reviews and meta-analyses in English, which compared the outcomes of FB and MB UKA. There were two of us who independently screened titles and abstracts, reviewed full texts, and extracted data. The initial search yielded 2,443 records, which were reduced to 887 studies after removing duplicates, and 36 studies were selected for full-text review. Finally, the umbrella review included eight systematic reviews and meta-analyses [1–8]. The methodological quality of the included studies was rated as low for six studies and moderate for one according to the Assessment of Multiple Systematic Reviews 2 (AMSTAR 2) tool [9]. The included meta-analyses, published between 2009 and 2023, encompassed a variety of study designs, including retrospective, randomized controlled, and prospective studies. These studies varied considerably in sample size, ranging from 323 to 17,405 participants.

One or more of the authors of this paper have disclosed potential or pertinent conflicts of interest, which may include receipt of payment, either direct or indirect, institutional support, or association with an entity in the biomedical field which may be perceived to have potential conflict of interest with this work. For full disclosure statements refer to <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2024.10.037>.

* Address correspondence to: Fatih Yildiz, MD, Department of Orthopedics, Bezmialem Vakif University Faculty of Medicine, Iskender Pasa District Adnan Menderes Boulevard, Fatih, Istanbul 34093, Turkey.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2024.10.037>

0883-5403/© 2024 Elsevier Inc. All rights are reserved, including those for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies.

Functional outcomes were reported in six studies [1,2,4,6–8]. There was one study that demonstrated that FB had superior results compared to MB in terms of Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) weighted mean difference (WMD): -5.06 , 95% confidence interval (CI): -6.53 to -3.6) and Knee Society Score (WMD: -0.94 , 95% CI: -1.59 to -0.29) for medial UKA [7]. However, the results were conflicting, with several studies reporting no significant difference between the two designs in mixed (medial and lateral) UKA populations [1,2,5,6]. The results for the range of motion (ROM) after UKA were also inconsistent, with one study favoring FB (WMD: -1.51 , 95% CI: -2.84 to -0.18) [7] and others showing no significant difference between the designs [1,2,6,8].

Radiological outcomes were evaluated in six studies [1–4,7,8]. There were two studies that found that MB was associated with a significantly lower rate of bearing wear compared to FB (odds ratio [OR]: 0.11, 95% CI: 0.02 to 0.61 and OR: 11.60, 95% CI: 1.52 to 88.57) [7,8].

Additionally, one study reported that more knees in the MB group had a neutral limb alignment than those in the FB group (OR: 2.63, 95% CI: 1.45 to 4.78) [7]. However, no significant differences were found between the two groups in terms of other radiographic outcomes, such as hip-knee-ankle angle (OR: 0.51, 95% CI: -3.03 to 2.01), femoral-tibial angle (OR: 0.60, 95% CI: -0.11 to 1.31), and postoperative radiolucent lines (OR: 1.46, 95% CI: 0.15 to 14.03 and OR: 0.8, 95% CI: 0.1 to 5.7) [1,2,7,8].

The umbrella review showed that there is no difference between the MB and FB designs in revision rates and survivorship for mUKA [1–4,6–8]. However, in two of the meta-analyses by Cao et al. and Chang et al., the mean time for the reoperation was significantly shorter in the MB group than in the FB group [1,2]. Bearing dislocation was one of the reasons for early reoperation and revisions in MB groups [7,8].

The FB and MB implants also showed similarities in the other outcomes, including quality of life parameters, postoperative persistent pain, intraoperative tibial plateau fracture, tibial component subsidence, periprosthetic fracture, aseptic loosening, deep infection, and progression of osteoarthritis [1,2,4,6–8].

This umbrella review demonstrates that the indications for revision differ between FB and MB mUKAs. FB implants have a lower risk of bearing dislocation and a longer time for revision, while MB implants offer a lower risk of bearing wear. The current review therefore concludes that FB and MB implants provide similar outcomes for mUKA in terms of patient-reported outcome measures, ROM, and revision rates [2,7,8].

For the lateral compartment, the use of a FB design is recommended because the knee joint is less constrained on the lateral side, which potentially increases the risk of bearing dislocation when a MB implant is used. In a meta-analysis by Wang et al., 5,470 lateral UKAs in 26 studies were evaluated, and the survivorship rate was found to be higher for FB than MB at early in years (OR: 0.96 [0.95 to 0.98], $P = 0.04$) and mid-term define in years (OR: 0.94 [0.93 to 0.96], $P = 0.01$) follow-ups [5]. In another systematic review and meta-analysis, Abu Al-Rub et al. also found that FBs lasted

significantly longer before needing revision when used for the lateral compartment (pooled rate of revision for 100 patient years for FBs was 2.2 [1.3 to 3.6] versus 0.7 [0.4 to 1.2] for MBs, $P < 0.01$) [3]. They concluded that MB has a four-fold higher risk of revision in comparison to FB if used for lateral UKA. The current review also concludes that FB implants provide superior outcomes in terms of revision rates for lateral UKA.

Based on our understanding of the literature, there is no significant difference in patient-reported outcome measures, ROM, or revision rates between the two bearing designs. The literature supports that MB implants may offer a lower risk of bearing wear, but a higher risk for early revision because of bearing dislocation. For lateral UKA, the use of a FB implant may provide a better outcome because mobile bearing designs are associated with a higher risk of all-cause revision.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Fatih Yildiz: Writing – review & editing. **Mustafa Alper Ince-soy:** Writing – review & editing, Writing – original draft, Methodology, Data curation. **Efrain Diaz Borjon:** Writing – review & editing, Supervision. **Mustafa Senyurt:** Investigation, Data curation. **Neil Sheth:** Supervision. **Abtin Alvand:** Supervision.

References

- [1] Cheng T, Chen D, Zhu C, Pan X, Mao X, Guo Y, et al. Fixed- versus mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: are failure modes different? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* 2013;21:2433–41. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-012-2208-y>.
- [2] Cao Z, Niu C, Gong C, Sun Y, Xie J, Song Y. Comparison of fixed-bearing and mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Arthroplasty* 2019;34:3114–3123.e3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2019.07.005>.
- [3] Abu Al-Rub Z, Lamb JN, West RM, Yang X, Hu Y, Pandit HG. Survivorship of fixed vs mobile bearing unicompartmental knee replacement: a systematic review and meta-analysis of sixty-four studies and National Joint Registries. *Knee* 2020;27:1635–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knee.2020.09.004>.
- [4] Smith TO, Hing CB, Davies L, Donell ST. Fixed versus mobile bearing unicompartmental knee replacement: a meta-analysis. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res* 2009;95:599–605. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.otsr.2009.10.006>.
- [5] Wang Z, Ni J, Mao Z, Yu M, Li H, Chen G, et al. Survival of lateral unicompartmental knee arthroplasty at short-, mid-, and long-term follow-up: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *ANZ J Surg* 2023;93:980–8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ans.18244>.
- [6] Migliorini F, Maffulli N, Cuozzo F, Elsner K, Hildebrand F, Eschweiler J, et al. Mobile bearing versus fixed bearing for unicompartmental arthroplasty in monocompartmental osteoarthritis of the knee: a meta-analysis. *J Clin Med* 2022;11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jcm11102837>.
- [7] Huang F, Wu D, Chang J, Zhang C, Qin K, Liao F, et al. A comparison of mobile- and fixed-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasties in the treatment of medial knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 1,861 patients. *J Knee Surg* 2021;34:434–43. <https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0039-1697901>.
- [8] Zhang W, Wang J, Li H, Wang W, George DM, Huang T. Fixed- versus mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis. *Sci Rep* 2020;10:19075. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-76124-z>.
- [9] Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. Amstar 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ* 2017;358:j4008. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008>.