

SAIPH[®] Knee System

Clinical Rationale

Inherent Stability.
Uniquely Normal.

Forever **Active**

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Principles of the SAIPH® 'Medially Stabilised' Knee	3
3	Clinical Heritage: Success of the MRK™	4
4	Clinical Function of the SAIPH® Knee	5
5	Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs)	8
6	Patient Satisfaction with the SAIPH® Knee	10
7	Longevity of the SAIPH® Knee	11
8	Orthopaedic Data Evaluation Panel (ODEP)	13
9	Summary: Supporting Evidence-Based Decisions	14
10	Key Literature	15
12	References	17
13	Notes	19

Patents

EP1329205 / US6869448

Manufactured by **MatOrtho Limited**

19/20 Mole Business Park | Randalls Road | Leatherhead | Surrey | KT22 7BA | UK

T: +44 (0)1372 224 200 | info@MatOrtho.com

For more information visit: www.MatOrtho.com

© **MatOrtho Limited** 2022

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system.

1 Introduction

The SAIPH® Knee is a 2nd generation medial ball-and-socket knee. It is an evolved design based on the clinically successful Medial Rotation Knee™ (MRK™) that has been used since 1994. Like the MRK™, the SAIPH® Knee was designed on the principle that by providing natural asymmetry across all three compartments, better function and increased patient satisfaction can be achieved without the compromises of other total knee replacement (TKR) designs. The design principle was proven with the Medial Rotation Knee™ and is now demonstrated with the SAIPH® Knee.

The SAIPH® Knee has been in clinical use since 2009 with over 10,000¹ knees implanted worldwide

2 Principles of the SAIPH® ‘Medially Stabilised’ Knee

Tibiofemoral Articulation

The SAIPH® Knee design is based on the principle of medial stability in the normal knee, which has been described in historical literature² and widely in recent literature^{3,4,5}. In normal, healthy knees the shapes of the medial and lateral tibial condyles are different: the medial side is concave; the lateral side is convex. Stability is provided collectively by the collateral ligaments (MCL and LCL), both cruciate ligaments (ACL and PCL) and the menisci. The shapes of the articular surfaces and the arrangement of stabilising soft tissue structures collectively provide greater stability about the medial condyle. Knee flexion is accompanied by axial rotation of the femur with respect to the tibia, which is achieved with a limited freedom for antero-posterior (AP) movement of the lateral femoral condyle relative to the tibia.

Stability throughout flexion is crucial to normal knee function: a knee with a deficient ACL or medial meniscus, for example, is likely to be unstable and may require corrective surgery. Standard TKRs require removal of the menisci, ACL and commonly the PCL, and they do not fully substitute for their functions. Those that intend to retain the PCL may not reliably do so⁶.

The SAIPH® Knee is different: it substitutes for **all** the removed structures. Inherent stability is provided throughout the full range of motion (ROM) with a medial deep-dish ball-and-socket articulation⁷. A semi-conforming lateral articulation permits AP translation during activities that require it while limiting excessive (unnatural) movement⁷.

This clinical rationale describes the **clinical evidence** that the SAIPH® Knee provides **inherent stability, a near normal tibiofemoral kinematic pattern** and **no restriction to the patient’s range of motion**. It also describes data that links these features to a **demonstrably higher rate of patient satisfaction**.

Patellofemoral Articulation

Whether or not the patella is resurfaced, TKR surgery includes replacing the patellofemoral articulation. Hence, the patellofemoral joint (PFJ) design is equally important for any high-functioning TKR device.

The normal trochlea is lateral to the midline^{8,9} and with an asymmetric patella the normal patella tracks laterally in flexion^{9,10}. The lateralised patella also plays a role in stabilising the lateral tibiofemoral articulation.

Most standard TKR devices are restricted to a centrally located trochlea – a necessity for standard femoral condylar design¹¹ – and the resulting patella tracking does not compare well to the normal knee¹². The SAIPH® Knee, however, features a physiologically lateralised trochlea, like the MRK^{11,12}, which exhibits a similar amount of lateral patella translation during flexion as patients without a TKR¹².

With the right trochlea design, choosing not to replace the patella has not been shown to influence outcomes¹³. Nevertheless, the SAIPH® Knee is available with the same unique saddle-shaped patella, which can rotate to match the femur for a fully conforming interface, and has 40 years of successful clinical heritage^{13,14,15,16,17}. The SAIPH® Knee is also available with a cemented dome-shaped patella button.

3 Clinical Heritage: Success of the MRK™

The MRK™, also manufactured by MatOrtho® (previously Finsbury), is the original 1994 'medial ball-and-socket knee' and remains in popular use. The clinical success of the MRK™ has strong relevance as a 'proof of concept' to the expected long-term outcomes for the SAIPH® Knee, which is an evolution of the original design.

Overall, the MRK™ has been shown to provide greater inherent stability than comparator devices^{18,19,20}. Patients with a medially stabilised knee notice the difference, and express that they prefer the design over posterior-substituting (PS), cruciate retaining (CR) and mobile designs, citing feelings of stability, normality and strength on stairs as reasons for their preference^{21,22}. With its lateralised trochlea¹¹ the MRK™ exhibits a more normal patellar function¹². It provides better restoration of ROM when compared to a standard PS knee design²³ and mean ROM is equal that of a 'high-flex' knee²⁴. When compared to all other TKR designs, NJR collected patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) show that the benefits of the MRK™ are reflected in higher functional scores^{22,23} and improved rates of success and satisfaction when compared to other TKRs^{20,22}. The MRK™ also provides better high-end function for categories of daily living, sport and exercise, movement and lifestyle included in the total knee function questionnaire (TKFQ). In this questionnaire, patients who received an MRK™ have scored significantly better 1 and 2 years postoperatively than counterparts who had received the most commonly used standard PS knee in the UK at the time²³.

Survivorship for the MRK™ is the best of all TKR devices available: it has been reported with the LOWEST revision rate of ALL TKRs in the NJR more times than any other brand – 50% of all reporting instances since the NJR started reporting device brands in its 2009 Annual Report^{16,24}. In the most recent 18th Annual Report (2021), the MRK™ has the *lowest* revision rate of all TKR brands at 17 years, the longest time point reported by the NJR, with a revision rate of 3.23% (95% CI: 2.69-3.87)¹⁷.

The MRK™ has an ODEP 15A rating for its use with and without the saddle-shaped patella²⁵.

The MRK™ has the LOWEST revision rate of all TKR brands at 17 years: 3.23% (95% CI 2.69-3.87)¹⁷ and is awarded an ODEP 15A rating²⁵.

The SAIPH® Knee has evolved from the original ball-and-socket device (MRK™) to incorporate all features associated with the clinical success of the concept. **It is the only TKR in the world designed wholly for the medially stabilised concept** without compromise, inherited or to accommodate other bearing options.

Stability

A 'medial pivot' design implies that a TKR should always exhibit a medial centre of rotation. But this is *not* the case: the normal knee centre of rotation is not static and, in some activities, lateral AP translation is suppressed⁴. The fundamental and essential characteristic of a normal knee is that it is *always* stable – *throughout* flexion. In the native knee, the provision of stability by the articular shapes and constraining tissues is greatest on the medial side but all compartments including the lateral and patellofemoral compartments contribute to stability. If any compartment is neglected, the outcome is compromised. As such, the defining principle of MatOrtho® ball-and-socket knees is the provision of **full-ROM stability**. Because this is achieved with a medial deep-dish ball-and-socket articulation the concept is better termed 'medially stabilised'. However overall stability is achieved with appropriate constraint in *all* compartments, and this is demonstrated by assessment of total knee AP stability throughout ROM.

The defining characteristic of MatOrtho® ball-and-socket knees is provision of full-ROM stability.

Patients studied using fluoroscopic evaluation exhibited no paradoxical anterior translation of the femoral condyles during flexion in any activity, confirming the design intent for inherent full ROM stability (Figure 1)⁷. This feature is also confirmed in the 5-year follow up of 100 knees by Katchky *et al.*, who found no incidence of symptomatic AP instability in patients³⁰.

In a study of 64 patients (mean age 72 years; mean follow-up 33.7 months) with four different knee designs (rotating platform LCS design, DePuy; cruciate retaining Triathlon, Stryker; medially stabilised knees SAIPH® Knee and MRK™, MatOrtho®) sagittal stability was measured at four degrees of flexion: 0°; 30°; 60°; and 90°, to examine the effect of design on mid-flexion stability³³. Sagittal stability was similar in all four groups in full extension; however the MRK™ and SAIPH® Knee designs showed significantly improved stability in the mid-range of flexion (30–60°) (Figure 2)³³.




Figure 2 Sagittal stability for 4 knee designs at different degrees of flexion³³.

In a separate similar study of 60 patients with four TKR designs (medially stabilised, cruciate retaining '1', cruciate retaining '2' and cruciate retaining 'deep dish') sagittal stability was measured using the KT1000 at 30° and 90°²⁷. Patients were recruited from three centres (three surgeons each implanting 10 SAIPH® Knees and 10 comparative knees). Patients were matched for age, gender, BMI and time to follow-up. When comparing medially stabilised knees (SAIPH® Knee) to cruciate retaining '1' knees, AP movement was significantly less in the SAIPH® Knees at both 30° ($p=0.037$) and 90° ($p=0.030$)²⁷. When comparing SAIPH® Knees to cruciate retaining '2' knees, AP movement was significantly less in the SAIPH® Knees at 30° ($p=0.013$) and less at 90° although not significant ($p=0.156$)²⁷. When comparing SAIPH® Knees to cruciate retaining 'deep dish' knees, AP movement was significantly less in the SAIPH® Knees at both 30° ($p=0.030$) and 90° ($p=0.048$)²⁷. When

comparing all SAIPH® Knees to all non-medially stabilised knees, AP movement was significantly less in the SAIPH® Knees at both 30° (p=0.003) and 90° (p=0.008)²⁷.

To compare surgeons' perception of sagittal anteroposterior (AP) stability after total knee replacement, 60 videos were taken of an AP drawer test of 60 patients performed by an examiner who was blinded as to what knee design each patient had received. Nine surgeons, who were blinded as to what knee design each video presented, were asked to grade the stability of all knees by determining whether they exhibited <5mm, 5-10mm or >10mm AP translation. Results demonstrated that the SAIPH® Knees were consistently perceived to be more stable than the cruciate retaining and 'deep dish' designs: 74% stable SAIPH® Knees vs. 38-40% other knee types (Figure 3)²⁷.

The SAIPH® Knee is inherently stable throughout flexion, like the normal knee.




Figure 3 Stability assessment of 60 patients with four designs of knee, finding 74% of SAIPH® Knees were stable in contrast to 40% or less for other knee designs²⁷.

5 Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs)

The early consecutive series of patients participating in the fluoroscopic evaluation reported PROMs outcomes including mean (range): KOOS pain, 92 (69-100); KOOS symptoms, 91 (82-100); KOOS daily activities, 91 (72-100); KOOS sports, 62 (0-100); KOOS QoL, 78 (38-100)⁷. These values are excellent when compared to reference mean values from a non-osteoarthritic population of similar age³⁵.

Between December 2015 and July 2019, 588 knees (549 patients) were enrolled into a multicentre study by 15 independent non-inventor surgeons in 13 hospitals. At the time of reporting, 293 knees (274 patients) patients had completed a minimum of 2-years post-operation³². Demographics were indicative of a standard TKR population: average age 68 years (46-92), 52% female, mean BMI 31 (15-59). The study collected patient reported outcome measures (PROMs) including KOOS, OKS, UCLA Activity and EQ5D-5L and range of motion preoperatively and 1 and 2 years postoperatively. The Forgotten Joint Score and 3 satisfaction questions were taken at the 1 and 2-year intervals. Surgical details, comorbidities, complications and radiological assessment were also completed. Improvements were observed for all outcome measures, consistently achieving excellent scores³² based on expectations from population studies³⁵ (Figure 4). PROMs data for 381 patients from this same cohort is also described in followed-up at 1 year in Eckhard *et al.*³⁶.




Figure 4 Improvements in all PROMs scores from a 274-patient SAIPH® Knee cohort at 2-year follow-up³².

A study of 206 patients (mean 67 years old) followed up to 2 years from 4 centres reported on outcomes including the Oxford Knee Score (OKS), Kujala score, KOOS scores and EQ-5D visual analogue scale and found significant health gains in all measures with 95% responding good to excellent in the OKS according to the 'Kalairajah' method of categorising the OKS³⁴ (mean: OKS 42.8, health gain 19; KOOS pain 92; KOOS symptoms 87.8; KOOS daily living 91.6; KOOS sports 66.5; KOOS QoL 82.2)²⁹.

Five-year postoperative data for a cohort of 100 SAIPH® Knees (92 patients; mean 68 years old) performed in two centres has been reported³⁰. Patient-reported outcome measures included the KOOS, WOMAC, Oxford Knee Score, Forgotten Joint Score (FJS) and the EQ-5D score³⁰. The data for this cohort showed significant improvement postoperatively ($p < 0.0001$) for all PROMs measures³⁰, including excellent OKS (mean 44) and KOOS scores (mean pain 94.7; symptoms 92.4; daily living 93.5; sports 71.3; QoL 82.2)³⁰. This study also reported a similar Forgotten Joint Score (mean 75.3³⁰) to that found in the single-surgeon comparative study (mean 79.9)²⁸, commenting that this score is considerably better than previously reported TKR cohorts³⁷ and equal to reports for unicondylar knee arthroplasty (UKA) patients³⁸.

SAIPH® Knee patients are consistently achieving excellent outcomes in all PROMs.

In their KT1000 study of 64 patients with four knee designs, Munir *et al.* also measured Oxford knee score, WOMAC knee score, SF12 and Kujala patellofemoral knee scores and found better patient-reported satisfaction and functional scores in the MRK™ and SAIPH® Knee than rotating platform and cruciate retaining designs³³.

In their stability study of 60 patients Jacobs *et al.* found a significant difference in WOMAC score ($p=0.016$), Oxford Knee Score (OKS; $p=0.015$), short-form KOOS ($p=0.040$) and Forgotten Joint Score (FJS; $p=0.009$) between the SAIPH® Knee and all non-medially stabilised knees²⁷. When comparing all stable and unstable knees in their study, highly significant correlations were found between stable knees and better scores (KOOS pain, $p=0.008$; KOOS daily activities, $p=0.012$; KOOS sport, $p=0.001$; WOMAC pain, $p=0.004$; WOMAC function, $p=0.018$; WOMAC overall, $p=0.0$; OKS, $p=0.0$; and FJS, $p=0.049$)²⁷.

SAIPH® Knee patients are associated with better scores than other TKR designs.

To objectively determine whether or not use of the SAIPH® Knee would benefit patients, one surgeon performed a consecutive series of 103 patients, randomly selected to receive a cruciate retaining (CR) knee (Vanguard, Zimmer Biomet) established in the surgeon’s practice (50 knees) or the SAIPH® Knee that was new to the practice (53 knees)²⁸. PROMs were the primary outcome measure for the study and included the KOOS, KOOS-12, KOOS-Shortform, KOOS-Jr, WOMAC, OKS, EQ-5D-5L and UCLA Activity Scale pre-operatively and at 1-year follow-up and the FJS and VAS-Satisfaction at 1-year follow-up. There was no significant difference between groups for the majority of the commonly-used PROMs measures. However, the SAIPH® Knee patients reported significantly better ($p<0.05$) outcomes for KOOS Quality of Life sections and concerning whether or not they had modified their lifestyle to avoid activities potentially damaging to their knee. Furthermore, patients scored significantly better for the Forgotten Joint Score overall 79.9 for the SAIPH® Knee group compared to 63.8 for the CR knee group ($p=0.005$), with significantly better scores for 8 of the 12 questions (sitting on a chair, $p=0.001$; walking for more than 15 minutes, $p=0.011$; taking a bath, $p=0.003$; travelling in a car, $p=0.004$; walking on uneven ground, $p=0.018$; standing up, $p=0.016$; doing housework, $p=0.001$; and taking a walk/hiking, $p=0.003$). For all remaining questions (in bed at night, climbing stairs, standing for a long time and doing favourite sport) the SAIPH® Knee group scored better than the CR group but without statistical significance.

While both implants performed well with equivalent clinical and functional outcomes to other successful contemporary knee designs, there was a difference in the high-end functionality measures. SAIPH® Knee patients reported that they were less likely to modify their lifestyle to accommodate their knee replacement, more likely to ‘forget’ their knee in everyday life and to report a better quality of life 1-year after their surgery.

SAIPH® Knee patients are more likely to report that they can ‘forget’ their knee during everyday life.




Figure 5 SAIPH® Knee patients are more likely to ‘forget’ their artificial joint during everyday activities: (a) mean Forgotten Joint Score (FJS) for patients in the SAIPH® and CR knee groups reported by French *et al.*²⁸ and (b) responses to individual questions of the FJS for SAIPH® and CR groups based on raw data presented by French *et al.*²⁸. *Each question has 5 responses scored 0 (never aware of their artificial joint) to 4 (mostly aware of their artificial joint). The FJS for each patient is produced using the sum of all scores divided by the number of questions answered by the patient. The mean score is multiplied by 25 to obtain a score out of 100 and is then subtracted from 100 to indicate a higher degree or ‘forgetting’ the artificial joint³⁹. Values in graph (b) were produced in a comparable way but using mean score for each individual question.

6 Patient Satisfaction with the SAIPH® Knee

In their 2-year follow up study, Walter *et al.* used a visual analogue scale (VAS) for patient satisfaction and found that 95.3% responded positively (responding 8-10 on a 10-point scale), which they commented was unusual in their previous knee cohorts and was equivalent to satisfaction responses for their own hip cohorts (95.2%) at the same timepoint²⁹. In their stability study of 60 patients Jacobs *et al.* found that patients with SAIPH® Knees were more likely to be satisfied with their outcome than patients with non-medially stabilised knees (>7.5 VAS satisfaction: 97% SAIPH® vs 83% other; p=0.08), which became significant (p=0.048) when comparing all stable to all unstable knees in their study²⁷. In one surgeon's consecutive series comparing SAIPH® patients with those who had received his established device, SAIPH® patients scored mean 9.3 on the same VAS-satisfaction scale²⁸.

In their 5-year postoperative data for a cohort of 100 SAIPH® Knees, Katchky *et al.* found that when asked: "How would you describe the results of your operation?" (Success), 98% of patients responded that the results of their operation were 'good' to 'excellent' (Figure 6)³¹. In their 274-patient multicentre study, Bare *et al.* reported an equally high degree of satisfaction: 96.4% of patients described the results of their operation as 'good' to 'excellent' (Figure 7)³².

When asked "Overall, how are your problems now compared to before your operation?" (Satisfaction), Katchky *et al.* reported that 98% of patients responded with 'much better' (Figure 6)³¹. Bare *et al.* found 97.2% of their patients said their problems were 'better than before surgery' with 92.6% saying 'much better' 2 years after their surgery (Figure 7)³². Bare *et al.* reported that results were reproducible for all surgeons: median satisfaction for every surgeon's cohort was ≥ 9 out of 10³². Unlike recent reports on patient satisfaction after total knee replacement^{40,41,42}, SAIPH® Knee cohorts do not display a 15-20% dissatisfaction rate^{27,28,29,30,32}.

Unlike recent reports on patient satisfaction after total knee replacement, SAIPH® Knee cohorts do NOT display a 15-20% dissatisfaction rate.




Figure 6 Success and satisfaction outcomes for a 100-patient SAIPH® Knee cohort at 5-year follow-up³¹.




Figure 7 Patient satisfaction: (a) "overall, how are your problems now, compared to before your knee replacement?" and (b) "how would you describe the results of your knee replacement?"³².

7 Longevity of the SAIPH® Knee

Secure Fixation

Other manufacturers have introduced a ball-and-socket asymmetric tibial constraint to platforms with a traditional 'keel' tibial design used on unconstrained bearing options. Some have also produced cementless component versions. Higher revision rates^{17,43}, particularly tibial loosening⁴⁴ have been associated with these combined design characteristics. The MRK™ and SAIPH® Knees include a different fixation design to traditional keel designs, which is intended to support rotational torque at the implant-bone interface.

The first clinical follow up on MRK™ patients who had received the implant from 1994 commented specifically on the matter and showed that the increased congruence of the asymmetric tibial bearing had not increased the rate of loosening¹⁵. From 15,921 procedures recorded by the NJR over 18.5 years, the MRK™ has been revised for aseptic loosening of the tibia significantly fewer times ($p < 0.001$) than all other TKRs in the UK¹⁶.

The SAIPH® Knee features an optimised stem-and-pegs design with a stippled cement interlocking interface with additional anti-rotation fins. From radiographic analysis Katchky *et al.* found no progressive lucent lines, no non-progressive lucent lines $> 2\text{mm}$ and there were no incidences of osteolysis at 5 years follow-up³⁰. Just one SAIPH® Knee has been revised in the UK for aseptic loosening of the tibia, which is below expectations based on all other TKRs in the NJR ($p = 0.282$)⁴⁵. Radiostereometric analysis (RSA) also indicates stability of the components⁴⁶ and this is now supported by low revision rates > 5 years follow-up^{17,43}.

Survivorship in Outcomes Studies

In their independent 11-surgeon multicentre study of the SAIPH® Knee, from 408 SAIPH® Knees implanted, Baré *et al.* reported a survivorship of 97.8% at 2 years³². In their study of 225 patients, Walter *et al.* reported 98.7% survivorship at 2 years²⁹. In their five-year outcomes study from two centres and 100 patients, Katchky *et al.* reported a 98% survivorship³⁰. All studies reported comparable complications to other TKR populations^{29,30,32}.

Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry (AOANJRR)

In its 2021 Annual Report, the AOANJRR has sufficient data to present revision rates for some TKR devices up to 20 years post operation. The overall revision rate for all TKRs is 3.3% at 5 years, 4.8% at 10 years, 6.5% at 15 years and 8.1% at 20 years for indication of osteoarthritis, which accounts for 97.7% of procedures⁴³.

A trend to increasing use of medially stabilised knees is reported by the AOANJRR used since 2012. In 2020 use of medially stabilised knees increased to 9.8% of all TKRs⁴⁷. Given the recent rise in use, medially stabilised knees represent a shorter follow-up period and fewer knees than the traditional CR and PS knee types. Nevertheless, medially stabilised knees are demonstrating lower cumulative percent revision rates than other knee types in the longer term with 6.0% at 15 years⁴⁸.

When compared to other medially stabilised knee designs, the SAIPH® and MRK™ knees are reported with the lowest cumulative rate of revisions for primary diagnosis of OA with mean **2.2% at 5 years post operation** (95% CI: 1.7-2.9) for the SAIPH® Knee (Figure 8), which compares favourably to the rate of revisions for all knees with primary diagnosis of OA at the same time point (3.3%) and is in line with the best-performing minimally stabilised knee designs⁴⁹.

The medially stabilised knee category has the lowest rate of revisions of all knee categories in the longer term and the SAIPH® and MRK™ knees have the lowest rates of revisions of all medially stabilised knees.

Insert	N Revised	N Total	1 Yr	3 Yrs	5 Yrs	10 Yrs	15 Yrs	20 Yrs
GMK Sphere Primary	291	12844	1.3 (1.1, 1.5)	2.9 (2.6, 3.3)	3.4 (3.0, 3.9)			
Evolution	210	9168	0.9 (0.7, 1.1)	2.4 (2.1, 2.8)	3.3 (2.8, 3.8)			
SAIPH	60	4073	0.5 (0.3, 0.8)	1.8 (1.4, 2.4)	2.2 (1.7, 2.9)			
Advance II	123	1696	1.8 (1.3, 2.5)	4.5 (3.6, 5.6)	5.5 (4.5, 6.7)	7.3 (6.1, 8.7)	8.2 (6.8, 9.9)	
Advance	39	733	1.5 (0.8, 2.7)	4.6 (3.3, 6.4)	5.3 (3.8, 7.2)	6.2 (4.5, 8.4)		
MRK	20	675	0.8 (0.3, 1.8)	2.3 (1.4, 3.8)	2.5 (1.5, 4.1)	3.7 (2.3, 5.9)		
TOTAL	743	29189						

Figure 8 AOANJRR cumulative percent revision of primary total knee replacement with a medially stabilised design (primary diagnosis OA)⁴⁹.

National Joint Registry (NJR)

Medially stabilised knees have been a regular feature of the NJR, despite not being recognised as a separate category. Over 25,000 medially stabilised knees have been recorded since the NJR started collecting data in 2003¹⁷. The majority of those procedures used the MRK™. In its 2021 Annual Report including data up to 31 December 2020, the NJR includes 1,855 SAIPH® Knees and a cumulative revision rate of **1.42% at 5 years post operation** (95% CI: 0.89-2.25), which is lower than the 5-year revision rate for the MRK™.

In the most recent Summary Data Report from the NJR on the SAIPH® Knee (February 2022), data is reported for 2,374 knees (2,103 patients) with mean implantation time of 3.1 years, maximum 12.1 years⁴⁵. Overall 25 knees have been revised (1%) and the reported cumulative revision rate is **2.2% at 9 years post operation** (95% CI: 1.0-4.9), which compares well to the 9-year cumulative revision rate of 3.0% (95% CI: 2.9-3.0) for all TKRs in the NJR⁴⁵.

8 Orthopaedic Data Evaluation Panel (ODEP)

ODEP provide a service evaluation for TKR ratings and award ratings based on ongoing assessment of implant performance (rate of revision), and the number of patients for which principally UK data is available. The registries and clinical studies described in this document report excellent rates of survivorship for the SAIPH® Knee, with cumulative revision rates lower than the average TKR revision rates and among the lowest of all available devices^{17,43,45}.

Within the MatOrtho® philosophy for safe introduction of new technology, the SAIPH® Knee was released with limited availability and under closely monitored use over the first 10 years. To ensure versions of implant brands are reported appropriately, ODEP separate devices into their available constructs. For the SAIPH® Knee, this means separating UK data for SAIPH® Knee procedures with no patella, with a cementless patella and with a cemented patella. Consequently, cohorts on which ODEP ratings are based for each construct remain small. The SAIPH® Knee is most commonly used in the UK without a patella resurfacing and so a longer rating is available for this construct. In all categories, the SAIPH® Knee revision rates are considerably lower than the requirement for each rating. ODEP ratings are shown in Figure 9.

The SAIPH® Knee is demonstrating exceptional performance with a consistent low revision rate and, as the number of patients who receive it grows, is on track to receive an ODEP 10A* rating.




Figure 9 ODEP ratings for SAIPH® Knee constructs.

For those interested in ODEP ratings, further information on ODEP criteria and use of ratings by hospitals can be found on the ODEP website www.odep.org.uk^{25,50,51}.

9 Summary: Supporting Evidence-Based Decisions

New technologies are essential to advance quality of care. MatOrtho® introduces innovative technologies gradually and responsibly, so that fewer patients are exposed to potential risk of failure whilst, as the evidence grows, as many patients as possible can ultimately benefit. Proper surveillance ensures that surgeons can uphold their responsibility for evidence-based decision making.

Since it was first introduced, surveillance activities for the SAIPH® Knee have included: functional studies investigating kinematics, ROM and stability throughout ROM; inventor-surgeon patient outcomes; independent non-inventor multicentre study outcomes; single-surgeon studies comparing outcomes with established TKR device; development of registry data; and independent review of data (ODEP).

SAIPH® Knee clinical studies are consistently reporting excellent outcomes^{30,32}. The SAIPH® Knee ODEP ratings^{25,51} are on track for and showing better outcomes than others that already have a 10A* rating. Registry data continues to demonstrate superior performance of the SAIPH® Knee when compared to other technologies^{43,45,49}.

A combination of normal tibiofemoral and patellofemoral function is necessary for high-end knee function^{52,53}. By demonstrating inherent stability throughout the full range of motion^{7,27,30,33} without compromising freedom of movement^{7,27,28,30,32}, SAIPH® Knee patients are more likely to be satisfied with the results of their operation than is reported elsewhere^{30,32,40,41,42}.

The SAIPH® Knee has a very positive and broad spectrum of data to support surgeon and hospital evidence-based decision-making processes.

10 Key Literature

Fluoroscopic motion study confirming the stability of a medial pivot design total knee arthroplasty.

Shimmin A, Martinez Martos S, Owens J, Iorgulescu AD, Banks S. *The Knee*. 2015; 22(6):522-526.

Abstract

Background: The ideal total knee arthroplasty should provide maximum range of motion and functional stability for all desired daily activities. The SAIPH® (MatOrtho; UK) knee has a medial pivot knee kinematic pattern designed to achieve medial stability and an asymmetric posterior translation of the lateral femoral condyle during knee flexion and in this way attempts to mimic the natural knee motion. This study aims to analyse knee kinematics of the SAIPH® total knee arthroplasty (TKA) by videofluoroscopy during four different weight-bearing activities.

Methods: Fourteen consecutive patients operated on by a single surgeon, with a minimum follow-up of 24 months were included in this IRB-approved study. There were no exclusions based on patient's functional level. A medially conforming knee was implanted in all cases. Participants in the study were asked to perform the clinically relevant functional activities of pivoting, kneeling, lunging and step-up/down activities while their knee motion was recorded by videofluoroscopy.

Results: Maximum knee flexion during the kneeling activity mean 127° (100°-155°). An asymmetric posterior translation of the lateral femoral condyle (LFC) was observed during pivoting, kneeling, lunging and stepping. No paradoxical anterior translation of the femoral condyles was observed in any activity.

Conclusion: The kinematics observed in this implant are similar in pattern, although smaller in magnitude, to normal functional knees, showing a posterior translation of the lateral femoral condyle during knee flexion, with internal rotation of the tibia, and no paradoxical anterior motion in any of the four weight bearing activities.

Medial ball and socket total knee arthroplasty. Five-year clinical results.

Katchky AM, Jones CW, Walter WL, Shimmin AS. *The Bone & Joint Journal*. 2019; 101-B (1 Supple A): 59-65.

Abstract

Aims: Between 15% and 20% of patients remain dissatisfied following total knee arthroplasty (TKA). The SAIPH knee system (MatOrtho, Surrey, United Kingdom) is a medial ball and socket TKA that has been designed to replicate native knee kinematics in order to maximize the range of movement, stability, and function. This system is being progressively introduced in a stepwise fashion, with this study reporting the mid-term clinical and radiological outcomes.

Patients and Methods: A retrospective review was undertaken of the first 100 consecutive patients with five-year follow-up following SAIPH TKA performed by the senior authors. The data that were collected included the demographics of the patients, clinical findings, the rate of intraoperative ligamentous release, patient-reported outcome measures (PROMS), radiological assessment, complications, and all-cause revision. Revision data were cross-checked with a national registry.

Results: A total of 100 TKAs in 92 patients were included. Three patients died (three TKAs) and a further two TKAs were revised. Of the remaining 95 TKAs, five-year follow-up data were available for 81 TKAs (85%) in 87 patients. There were significant improvements in all PROMs and high satisfaction. The mean ROM at final follow-up was from 0° (full extension) to 124° flexion. There were seven major complications (7%): one infection, two deep vein thromboses, one cerebrovascular event, and two patients with stiffness requiring a manipulation under anaesthesia. Two patients required a lateral retinacular release to optimize patellar tracking in valgus knees; no additional ligament releases were performed in any patient. Radiological analysis demonstrated no evidence of implant-related complications.

Conclusion: These results demonstrate satisfactory clinical and radiological outcomes at five years following a medial ball and socket TKA. The complication and revision rates are consistent with those previously reported for patients undergoing TKA. These results demonstrate the safety and efficacy of the SAIPH Knee TKA system and support its wider use.

A Single Surgeon Series comparing the Outcomes of a Cruciate Retaining and Medially-Stabilised Total Knee Arthroplasty using Kinematic Alignment Principles.

French SR, Munir DS, Brighton R. Journal of Arthroplasty. 2019; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2019.09.021>

Abstract

Aims: Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA) designs are developed to optimize kinematics and improve patient satisfaction. The Cruciate Retaining (CR) and Medially-Stabilised (MS) TKA designs have reported good midterm follow up outcomes. However, reasons for consistently high rates of patient dissatisfaction following a TKA remain poorly understood. To further investigate this, we compared the short-term functional outcomes and quality of life, using patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) and Range of Motion (ROM), between a CR and MS TKA.

Methods: A prospective comparison was made between 2 groups (44 CR-TKA vs 46 MS-TKA). The KOOS, KOOS-12, KOOS-Shortform, KOOS-JR, Oxford Knee Score, WOMAC, UCLA Activity Scale, and EQ-5D-5L were completed pre-operatively and one year post-operatively. The Forgotten Joint Score (FJS) and VAS-satisfaction were completed at one year post-operatively. ROM was collected pre-operatively and one year post-operatively.

Results: Patients who underwent an MS-TKA scored significantly better than the CR-TKA on the FJS (MS= 79.87, CR= 63.8, $p = .005$), the KOOS-12 Quality of Life subscale (MS= 82.8, CR= 74.4, $p = 0.43$) and the KOOS Quality of Life subscale (MS= 82.8, CR= 74.6, $p = 0.44$). There was no difference between the groups in all assessed PROMs or ROM, pre-operatively and one year post-operatively.

Conclusion: Patients who underwent the MS-TKA scored significantly better on the FJS and the quality of life subscale of the KOOS and KOOS-12 than those who underwent a CR-TKA. All other assessed PROMs and ROM were comparable between the two groups and demonstrated that both implants facilitated symptom relief and improved daily function at one year post-operatively. These findings suggest that at short-term follow-up, the MS device is more likely to allow a patient to “forget” that a joint has been replaced and restore their quality of life. Long-term assessment of MS-TKA design outcomes in larger cohorts is recommended.

12 References

- 1 MatOrtho® data, 1 May 2022.
- 2 Pinskerova V, Maquet P, Freeman MAR. Writings on the knee between 1836 and 1917. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2000; 82(8): 1100-1102.
- 3 Iwaki H, Pinskerova V, Freeman MA. Tibiofemoral movement 1: the shapes and relative movements of the femur and tibia in the unloaded cadaver knee. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2000; 82(8):1189-95.
- 4 Hill PF, Vedi V, Williams A, Iwaki H, Pinskerova V, Freeman MA. Tibiofemoral movement 2: the loaded and unloaded living knee studied by MRI. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2000; 82(8):1196-8.
- 5 Johal P, Williams A, Wragg P, Hunt D, Gedroyc W. Tibio-femoral movement in the living knee. A study of weight bearing and non-weight bearing knee kinematics using 'interventional' MRI. *J Biomech.* 2005; 38(2):269-76.
- 6 Shannon FJ, Cronin JJ, Cleary MS, Eustace SJ, Byrne JMO. The posterior cruciate ligament-preserving total knee replacement: do we 'preserve' it? A radiological study. *JBJS(Br).* 2007; 89-B:766-771.
- 7 Shimmin A, Martinez Martos S, Owens J, Iorgulescu AD, Banks S. Fluoroscopic motion study confirming the stability of a medial pivot design total knee arthroplasty. *The Knee.* 2015; 22(6): 522-526.
- 8 Eckhoff DG, Montgomery WK, Stamm ER and Kilcoyne RF. Location of the Femoral Sulcus in the Osteoarthritic Knee. *J of Arthrop.* 1996; 11 (2): 163-165.
- 9 Iranpour F, Merican AM, Dandachli W, Amis AA, Cobb JP. The geometry of the trochlear groove. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2010; 468(3):782-8.
- 10 Katchburian MV, Bull AM, Shih YF, Heatley FW, Amis AA. Measurement of patellar tracking: assessment and analysis of the literature. *Clin Orthop Relate Res.* 2003; 412: 241-59.
- 11 Schindler OS. The controversy of patellar resurfacing in total knee arthroplasty: Ibisne in medio tutissimus? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2012; 20:1227-1244 (ref. Figure 8, p1233).
- 12 Rhee SJ, Hossain F, Konan S, Ashby E and Haddad F. Patellar Tracking: A Comparison of an Implant with a Lateralised Trochlear Groove Compared to a Conventional Posterior Stabilised Design. *J Bone Joint Surg Br* 2012; 94-B no. SUPP IX 90.
- 13 Kulkarni SK, Freeman MA, Poal-Manresa JC, Asencio JI, Rodriguez JJ. The patellofemoral joint in total knee arthroplasty: is the design of the trochlea the critical factor? *J Arthroplasty.* 2000; 15(4):424-9.
- 14 Amin A, Al-Taiar A, Sanghrajka AP, Kang N, Scott G. The early radiological follow-up of a medial rotational design of total knee arthroplasty. *Knee* 2008; 15(3):222-6.
- 15 Mannan K and Scott G. The Medial Rotation total knee replacement: a clinical and radiological review at a mean follow-up of six years. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2009; 91(6):750-6.
- 16 National Joint Registry. Implant Summary Report for the MRK. Summary.Report.KP_Femoral_MRK.18/02/2022.
- 17 National Joint Registry for England, Wales, Northern Ireland and the Isle of Man. 18th Annual Report, 2021: Surgical data to 31 December 2020. www.njrreports.org.uk.
- 18 Moonot P, Mu S, Railton GT, Field RE, Banks SA. Tibiofemoral kinematic analysis of knee flexion for a medial pivot knee. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2009; 17(8):927-34.
- 19 Moonot P, Shang M, Railton GT, Field RE, Banks SA. In vivo weight-bearing kinematics with medial rotation knee arthroplasty. *Knee.* 2010; 17(1):33-7.
- 20 Molloy D, Jenabzadeh R, Walter W and Hasted T. Sagittal Stability in Three Different Knee Designs. A Single Centre Independent Review. *Bone Joint J* 2013; 95-B SUPP 15 85. Presented ISTA, Sydney, 2012 and The Great Debate, London, 2013.
- 21 Pritchett JW. Patients prefer a bicruciate-retaining or the medial pivot total knee prosthesis. *J Arthroplasty.* 2011; 26(2): 224-8.
- 22 Jonas SC, Argyropoulos M, Al-Hadithy N, Korycki M, Lotz B, Deo SD, Satish V. Knee arthroplasty with a medial rotating total knee replacement. Midterm clinical findings: A district general experience of 38 cases. *The Knee.* 2015; 22(2): 122-5.
- 23 Hossain F, Patel S, Rhee SJ, Haddad FS. Knee arthroplasty with a medially conforming ball-and-socket tibiofemoral articulation provides better function. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2011; 469(1):55-63.
- 24 Kooijman CM and van Stralen GMJ. Having the confidence to change for a more stable future. Presented at The Great Debate, London, 2013.
- 25 Orthopaedic Data Evaluation Panel (ODEP). Latest ODEP ratings can be found at www.odep.org.uk
- 26 Dennis DA, Komistek RD, Stiehl JB, Walker SA and Dennis KN. Range of Motion after Total Knee Arthroplasty: The Effect of Implant Design and Weight-Bearing Conditions. *J. Arth.* 1998; 13(7): 748-752.
- 27 Jacobs H, Jones C, Brighton R, Redgment A, Talbot S and Walter WL. Sagittal Stability: KT1000 and PROMs. Presented at the Forever Active Forum, Valencia, 2019.
- 28 French SR, Munir DS and Brighton R. A Single Surgeon Series comparing the Outcomes of a Cruciate Retaining and Medially-Stabilised Total Knee Arthroplasty using Kinematic Alignment Principles. *J. Arth.* 2019; doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arth.2019.09.021>.

- 29 Walter WL, Shimmin A, Richards L and McDonald L. SAIPH® Medial Ball and Socket Knee: 2-year Follow-Up of the First 200 Patients. Presented at the AOA ASM, Brisbane, 2016.
- 30 Katchky AM, Jones CW, Walter WL, Shimmin AS. Medial ball and socket total knee arthroplasty. Five-year clinical results. *Bone Joint J.* 2019; 101-B (1 Supple A): 59-65.
- 31 Katchky A, Shimmin A, Jones C and Walter WL. Minimum 5-year Follow-Up of the SAIPH® Medial Ball and Socket TKR. Presented at the AOA ASM, Adelaide, 2017.
- 32 Baré J. The SAIPH medial stabilized total knee arthroplasty: A multi-centre 2-year outcome study across Australia & New Zealand. Presented at Arthroplasty Society of Australia ASM, Adelaide, 2021
- 33 Munir S, Molloy D, Hasted T, Jack CM, Shimmin A and Walter WL. Sagittal Stability in Four Different Knee Designs. A Single Centre Independent Review. *Orthopaedic Proceedings.* 2016; 98-B (SUPP 4): 113. Presented at ISTA 27th Annual Congress, Kyoto, 2014.
- 34 Kalairajah Y, Azurza K, Hulme C, Molloy S and Drabu KJ. Health outcome measures in the evaluation of total hip arthroplasties – a comparison between the Harris hip score and the Oxford hip score. *J Arthroplasty* 20(8): 1037, 2005.
- 35 Paradowski PT, Bergman S, Sundén-Lundius A, Lohmander LS and Roos EM. Knee complaints vary with age and gender in the adult population. Population-based reference data for the Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS). *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.* 2006, 7:38.
- 36 Eckhard L, Munir S, Wood D, Talbot S, Brighton R, Walter WL, Bare J. The KOOS-12 shortform shows no ceiling effect, good responsiveness and construct validity compared to standard outcome measures after total knee arthroplasty. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-020-05904-x>
- 37 Thomsen MG, Latifi R, Kallemose T, Husted H, Troelsen A. Does knee awareness differ between different knee arthroplasty prostheses? A matched, case-control, cross-sectional study. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.* 2016; 17:141.
- 38 Thienpont E, Opsomer G, Koninckx A and Houssiau F. Joint awareness in different types of knee arthroplasty evaluated with the Forgotten Joint score. *J Arth.* 2014; 29(1):48-51.
- 39 Behrend H, Giesinger K, Giesinger JM and Kuster MS. The “Forgotten Joint” as the Ultimate Goal in Joint Arthroplasty. *J.Arth.* 2012; 27(3): 430-436.e1.
- 40 Baker PN, van der Meulen JH, Lewsey J, Gregg PJ. The role of pain and function in determining patient satisfaction after total knee replacement. Data from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2007; 89(7): 893.
- 41 Noble PC, Conditt MA, Cook KF and Mathis KB. Patient expectations affect satisfaction with total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Rel Res.* 2006; 452: 35–43.
- 42 Bourne RB, Chesworth BM, Davis AM, Mahomed NN and Charron KDJ. Patient Satisfaction after Total Knee Arthroplasty: Who is Satisfied and Who is Not? *Clin Orthop Rel Res.* 2010; 468: 57–63.
- 43 Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry. Hip, Knee & Shoulder Arthroplasty: 2021 Annual Report. Adelaide: AOA. 2021: Table KT7 <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com>.
- 44 Australian Orthopaedic Association. NJRR Hip and Knee Arthroplasty, Annual Report 2018: Prosthesis Investigations. <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com/documents/10180/578081/Advance%20%26%20Advance%20Combination>.
- 45 National Joint Registry. Implant Summary Report for the SAIPH® Knee. Summary.Report.KP_Femoral_Saiph.18/02/2022.
- 46 Schmid FA, Nivbrant O, Yates PJ. Radiostereometric Analysis of the Medial Rotation SAIPH® Knee. White paper. 2019
- 47 Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry. Hip, Knee & Shoulder Arthroplasty: 2021 Annual Report. Adelaide: AOA. 2021: Figure KT21. <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com>.
- 48 Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry. Hip, Knee & Shoulder Arthroplasty: 2021 Annual Report. Adelaide: AOA. 2021: Table KT20. <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com>.
- 49 Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry. Hip, Knee & Shoulder Arthroplasty: 2021 Annual Report. Adelaide: AOA. 2021: Table KT21. <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com>.
- 50 ODEP criteria introduced in 2018 are explained at: http://www.odep.org.uk/Portals/0/Forms/Criteria/ODEP_Criteria_Knees.pdf.
- 51 For ODEP statement on use of ratings by hospitals see: www.odep.org.uk/ODEPExplained/toHospitals.aspx.
- 52 Nakagawa SMD, Kadoya Y, Todo S, Kobayashi A, Sakamoto H, Freeman MAR and Yamano Y. Tibio-femoral movement 3: full flexion in the living knee studied by MRI. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2000; 82B: 1199–2000.
- 53 Moro-oka T, Matsuda S, Miura H, Nagamine R, Urabe K, Kawano T, Higaki H, Iwamoto Y. Patellar tracking and patellofemoral geometry in deep knee flexion. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2002; 394:161-8.

13 Notes



CE 1434



TGA Health Safety
Regulation
ARTG209556 ARTG209559
ARTG209557 ARTG209578
ARTG209559

Forever **Active**

MatOrtho Limited | 19/20 Mole Business Park | Randalls Road | Leatherhead | Surrey | KT22 7BA | UK

T: +44 (0)1372 224 200 | info@MatOrtho.com | For more information visit: www.MatOrtho.com

Part No. ML-300-168 | Issue 9