

Now disperse away worries of compliance from your patient's life
with a better and faster recovery with



DISPERZYME®

Trypsin B.P. 96mg, Bromelain 180mg, Rutoside Trihydrate B.P. 200mg

Dispersible tablets

The only brand with German Technology

Advanced technology

Each particle is enteric coated thus passes safely through stomach
and gives maximum intestinal absorption and bioavailability



For edema and inflammation in¹

Trauma
Post operative inflammation
Cellulitis
Wound healing

For soft tissue and sport injuries^{2,3}

Reduces pain and inflammation and helps in
faster recovery from


Tendonitis	Spondylopathies	Sprains
Frozen shoulder	Contusions	Bursitis

From pioneers of systemic enzyme therapy in India

Sources:
[1] D.N.Savant, H.K.Parikh, G.V.Daltary, Efficacy and tolerability of phlogenzym in controlling postoperative inflammation in patients undergoing major surgical resection and reconstruction for head and neck malignancies, Prospective randomized, open, phase III clinical trial, Tata memorial hospital, Mumbai 400012 [2] Rham H. D., Treatment of ankle distortion with Phlogenzym (1992) [3] Baumuller M., The use of hydrolytic enzymes in blunt soft tissue injuries and ankle distortion, General Medicine 19 (1990), 178.



Office:
81/A, Mittal Chambers,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400 021
Maharashtra.



JOURNAL OF ARTHROSCOPY AND JOINT SURGERY

JAJ S

Official Journal of the International Society for Knowledge for
Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty (ISKSAA)

Indexed In Scopus & Embase

Volume 4 Number 2 May–August 2017

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

E-ISSN: 2214-9635

P-ISSN: 2542-6001



ISKSAA International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty

ISKSAA (International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty) is a society of orthopaedic surgeons from around the world to share and disseminate knowledge, support research and improve patient care in Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty. We are proud to announce that ISKSAA membership is approaching the **1500** mark (India & Overseas) making it the **fastest growing Orthopaedic Association in the country** in just over 4 years of its inception . With over **260000 hits from over 146 countries** on the website www.isksaa.com & more and more interested people joining as members of ISKSAA, we do hope that ISKSAA will stand out as a major body to provide opportunities to our younger colleagues in training, education and fellowships.

Our Goals.....

- To provide health care education opportunities for increasing cognitive and psycho-motor skills in Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty
- To provide CME programs for the ISKSAA members as well as other qualified professionals.
- To provide Clinical Fellowships in Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty
- To provide opportunities to organise and collaborate research projects
- To provide a versatile website for dissemination of knowledge

ISKSAA Life Membership

The membership is open to Orthopaedic Surgeons, Postgraduate Orthopaedic students and Allied medical personal interested in Arthroscopy & Arthroplasty.

Benefits of ISKSAA Life membership include....

- Eligibility to apply for **ISKSAA's Prestigious Fellowship Programme** . We are finalising affiliations with ESSKA , ISAKOS , BOA , BASK , Wrightington and FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE , IMRI AUSTRALIA to provide more **ISKSAA Fellowships** in India , UK , USA , Australia and Europe . **We awarded 14 ISKSAA Fellowships in Feb 2013 , 6 ISKSAA IMRI fellowships in Feb 2014 , 54 ISKSAA fellowships in September 2014 , 22 ISKSAA wrightington MCh fellowships in December 2014 , 40 ISKSAA Fellowships in October 2015 , 15 ISKSAA Wrightington MCh Fellowships in December 2015 and 61 ISKSAA Fellowships in November 2016 .**
- **Free Subscription** of ISKSAA's official , SCOPUS INDEXED , EMBASE INDEXED peer reviewed , online scientific journal **Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery (JAJIS)** .
- **The next round of ISKSAA fellowships interviews will be in EAC-ISKSAA Chandigarh 2017 in October 2017 where we are offering 55 ISKSAA Clinical fellowships along with the ISKSAA Wrightington MCh Fellowships .**
- Only as a life member , you can enjoy the benefit of **reduced Congress charges** in **EAC-ISKSAA CHANDIGARH 2017 & ISKSAA LEEDS 2018 being held at Leeds , UK and participate in the Cadaveric workshops / Hospital visitations .**
- **Member's only section** on the website which has access to the conference proceedings and live surgeries of ISKSAA 2012 , 2013 & 2014 along with a host of other educational material .
- Important opportunity for interaction with world leaders in Arthroscopy & Arthroplasty .
- Opportunity to participate in ISKSAA courses and workshops

To enjoy all the benefits & privileges of an ISKSAA member, you are invited to apply for the Life membership of ISKSAA by going to the membership registration section of the website and entering all your details electronically. All details regarding membership application and payment options are available on the website (www.isksaa.com)



UNIDRIVE® S III ARTHRO

Your All-In-One Solution for Arthroscopy



STORZ
KARL STORZ — ENDOSKOPE
THE DIAMOND STANDARD

ART 62/06/2012/A-E

KARL STORZ GmbH & Co. KG, Mittelstraße 8, 78532 Tuttlingen/Germany, Phone: +49 (0)7461 708-0, Fax: +49 (0)7461 708-105, E-Mail: info@karlstorz.de
KARL STORZ Endoscopy America, Inc, 2151 E. Grand Avenue, El Segundo, CA 90245-5017, USA, Phone: +1 424 218-8100, Fax: +1 800 321-1304, E-Mail: info@kseal.com
KARL STORZ Endoscopia Latino-America, 815 N. W. 57 Av., Suite No. 480, Miami, FL 33126-2042, USA, Phone: +1 305 262-8980, Fax: +1 305 262-89 86, E-Mail: info@ksela.com
KARL STORZ Endoscopy Canada Ltd., 7171 Millcreek Drive, Mississauga, ON L5N 3R3, Phone: +1 905 816-4500, Fax: +1 905 858-4599, E-Mail: info@karlstorz.ca
www.karlstorz.com



Super-Vim Suture Anchor


**BAS-9002.50F Super-Vim Suture Anchor,
Dia. 5.0mm, Titanium (Loaded with two pc Biofiber), Sterile**

- Ideal for mini-open rotator cuff repair procedures
- Anchors made of Ti 6Al-4V ELI Titanium Alloy
- Multiple Biofibers dispense load over more of the tendon
- Independent Biofiber channels reduce suture binding
- Needlepoint tip permits atraumatic hand insertion through soft tissue
- Anchor's wide threads and small core optimize bone purchase
- Fully-threaded anchor body increases resistance to pull-out
- Laser etched markings on the drivers for insertion depth and suture orientation

Vim-Fix PK Suture Anchor

**BAS-9091.55F Vim-Fix PK III Suture Anchor,
Dia. 5.5mm (Loaded with three pc Biofiber), Sterile**

- Clinical used for primary or medial row fixation
- Fully threaded; Cancellous and cortical threads provide exceptional fixation strength
- Broaching punch minimizes cortical stress fractures
- Double or triple loaded with Biofiber suture
- Enhanced tip thread profile for easy insertion
- Provides initial fixation strength and stability
- Technique-create hole, screw-in anchor



BIOTEK - Chetan Meditech Pvt. Ltd.
Opp. V. S. Hospital, Ellisbridge,
Ahmedabad-380 006. Gujarat, INDIA.
Phone: +91 79 26578092 Fax: +91 79 26577639
Email: info@biotekortho.com
www.biotekortho.com



ISKSAA International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons
on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty

Wrightington, Wigan and Leigh 
NHS Foundation Trust



Edge Hill University



ISKSAA – Wrightington International Training Fellowships leading to MCh degree (2017)

Interested candidates are invited to apply for a unique opportunity for post-graduate education and subspecialist training in the UK

1. The interested candidates are encouraged to look at the University website link . The programme is aimed at motivated candidates who wish to come to UK to obtain 2-3 years of clinical experience, specialist surgical training and an MCh degree from Wrightington Hospital and Edge Hill University.
2. Initial application should be via email. Just send updated CV , photo along with 2 satisfactory recommendation letters from current / recent trainer to ISKSAA president at isksaafellowships@gmail.com. This will serve as an initial screening to judge eligibility. The last date for applications is **24th September 2017** .
3. The interviews are slated for 8th October during EAC - ISKSAA 2017 in Chandigarh with a team coming from the UK .
4. **Having cleared the IELTS exam** before the interviews will be of advantage for final selections .
5. The Clinical posts would start in August 2018 although if candidates were to be interested for Aug 2019 and August 2020 start, they could still apply.
6. The MCh course is at the Edge Hill University and although most of the payment for the course can be made along the way in installments over the 2 years, there would be an initial Commitment of £17,500 to be made to secure the place before the formalities with Royal colleges and GMC are commenced at this End. The salary scales are detailed with the information sheet as well.
7. There will be two posts per year as the "Wrightington - ISKSAA MCh Fellowship". There would be an **assured Wrightington placement** during the 2-year UK rotation via this stream . **Only ISKSAA Life Members can apply for these posts** .



Improve your ability to establish, execute and evaluate institutional research strategy

Elsevier's Research Intelligence solutions provides answers to the most pressing challenges that research administrators face. Our suite of innovative software solutions improves your ability to establish, execute and evaluate research strategy and performance.

Scopus

Track, analyze and visualize global research with our abstract and citation database of peer-reviewed literature, including scientific journals, books and conference proceedings covering the fields of science, technology, medicine, social sciences and arts and humanities.

SciVal

Visualize your institution's research performance, benchmark relative to peers, develop collaborative partnerships and explore research trends.

Mendeley

Organize your research, collaborate and connect with others online, and discover the latest research with our free reference manager and academic social network. Mendeley Institutional Edition includes premium user features and competency for researchers and librarians.

Pure

Develop reports on research output, carry out performance assessments, and showcase your researchers' expertise, all while reducing administrative burden for researchers, faculty and staff.

For a FREE custom report on your institution's research strengths, visit: elsevier.com/research-intelligence/ace



India's No. 1[#]
prescribed collagen

COLLAFLEX[®]



Body's Own **Kind of Collagen**

In Osteoarthritis,

In patients presenting...

-  Morning stiffness <30 minutes
-  No crepitus
-  Knee pain

Classified as GRAS¹

Just one
sachet a day
for minimum
3 months

Powered
with
FORTIGEL[®]



1. (Generally Recognized As Safe) As accessed on 20thjuly'12; <http://www.fortigel.com>.
#. IMS,OCT'15 Rx Audit (amongst plain Bioactive Collagen Peptide brands)

COLLAFLEX[®] PRO



Promotes Cartilage Health, Supports Mobility


In Osteoarthritis,

In patients presenting...

-  Morning stiffness > 30 minutes
-  Difficulty in climbing stairs
-  Fine crepitus
-  Knee pain

Powered
with
FORTIGEL[®]

Just one
sachet a day
for minimum
3 months



SANOFI

Sanofi India Ltd. Sanofi House, CTS No. 117-B,
L&T Business Park, Saki Vihar Road, Powai, Mumbai 400072.



Easy access to the research performance of 220 nations and 7,500 research institutions worldwide

SciVal

SciVal supports the needs of a broad range of institutional users by providing ready-made, at-a-glance snapshots for flexible, institution-specific insight.



Visualize research performance
Specific to Vice Rectors For Research

- Performance Overview to inform strategic planning
- Identify institution's strengths and short-comings



Develop collaborative partnerships
Specific to Department Heads

- Evaluate researcher and team performance for informed decisions
- Model-test scenarios by creating virtual teams



Benchmark your progress
Specific to Research Administrators

- Create management-level reports
- Accelerate institutional and cross-institutional collaboration
- Support and win large



Analyze research trends
Specific to Researchers

- Raise visibility and highlight achievements
- Expand networks
- Locate collaborators and mentors

For more information: elsevier.com



Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery

An official publication of International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty

(ISSN: 2214-9635)

Volume 4, Number 2, May–August 2017

Aims and Scope

Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery (JAJS) is committed to bring forth scientific manuscripts in the form of original research articles, current concept reviews, meta-analyses, case reports and letters to the editor. The focus of the Journal is to present wide-ranging, multi-disciplinary perspectives on the problems of the joints that are amenable with Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty. Though Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty entail surgical procedures, the Journal shall not restrict itself to these purely surgical procedures and will also encompass pharmacological, rehabilitative and physical measures that can prevent or postpone the execution of a surgical procedure. The Journal will also publish scientific research related to tissues other than joints that would ultimately have an effect on the joint function.

Author inquiries

You can track your submitted article at <http://www.elsevier.com/track-submission>. You can track your accepted article at <http://www.elsevier.com/trackarticle>. You are also welcome to contact Customer Support via <http://support.elsevier.com>

Copyright

© 2017, International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty. Published by Reed Elsevier India Pvt. Ltd. All rights reserved. Papers accepted for publication become the copyright of *International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty*, and authors will be asked to sign a transfer of copyright form, on receipt of the accepted manuscript by Elsevier. This enables the Publisher to administer copyright on behalf of the Authors, whilst allowing the continued use of the material by the Author for scholarly communication.

This journal and the individual contributions contained in it are protected under copyright by Elsevier Ltd., and the following terms and conditions apply to their use:

Photocopying

Single photocopies of single articles may be made for personal use as allowed by national copyright laws. Permission of the Publisher and payment of a fee is required for all other photocopying, including multiple or systematic copying, copying for advertising or promotional purposes, resale, and all forms of document delivery. Special rates are available for educational institutions that wish to make photocopies for non-profit educational classroom use.

For information on how to seek permission visit <http://www.elsevier.com/permissions> or call: (+44) 1865 843830 (UK) / (+1) 215 239 3804 (USA).

Derivative Works

Subscribers may reproduce table of contents or prepare lists of articles including abstracts for internal circulation within their institutions. Permission of the Publisher is required for resale or distribution outside the institution. Permission of the Publisher is required for all other derivative works, including compilations and translations (please consult www.elsevier.com/permissions).

Electronic Storage or Usage

Permission of the Publisher is required to store or use electronically any material contained in this journal, including any article or part of an article (please consult www.elsevier.com/permissions).

Except as outlined above, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Publisher.

Notice

No responsibility is assumed by the Publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein. Because of rapid advances in the medical sciences, in particular, independent verification of diagnoses and drug dosages should be made.

Although all advertising material is expected to conform to ethical (medical) standards, inclusion in this publication does not constitute a guarantee or endorsement of the quality or value of such product or of the claims made of it by its manufacturer.

Subscription information

The *Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery* (ISSN: 2214-9635) is published thrice a year. The annual price for **individual subscription** based in India is **INR 3600**; and for international subscribers, the annual price is **USD 60**. For **institutional subscription** within and outside India, please contact the Publishers office at journals.india@elsevier.com.

Further information is available on this journal and other Elsevier products through Elsevier's website (<http://www.elsevier.com>). Subscriptions are accepted on a prepaid basis only and are entered on a calendar year basis. Issues are sent by standard mail. Priority rates are available upon request. Claims for missing issues should be made within six months of the date of dispatch.

Orders, claims, advertisement and journal inquiries: Please visit our Support Hub page <https://service.elsevier.com> for assistance.

Editorial Office: Dr Pushpinder Singh Bajaj, Bajaj Specialist Clinics, B-7/5 Safdarjung Enclave, New Delhi – 110029. Tel: 41057555 / 41057556 / 41057557. Email: psbajaj@hotmail.com.

Publishing Office: Elsevier, A division of Reed Elsevier India Pvt. Ltd., 14th Floor, Building No.10B, DLF Cyber City, Phase-II, Gurgaon-122002, Haryana, India. Email: journals.india@elsevier.com

Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery

An official publication of International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty

(ISSN: 2214-9635)

Volume 4, Number 2, May–August 2017

Editor-in-Chief

PROF RAVI GUPTA Chandigarh

MR SANJEEV ANAND UK

Executive Editor

PROF LALIT MAINI Delhi

Managing Editor

DR PUSHPINDER BAJAJ Delhi

Deputy Editor

DR AMITE PANKAJ Delhi

Section Editors

Trauma & Rehabilitation

DR ALEXANDER WOOD UK

Hip

DR AJAY AGGARWAL USA

Foot & Ankle

DR MUNEEESH BHATIA UK

Training & Education

DR JANAK MEHTA Australia

Arthroplasty

DR MANOJ SOOD UK

Pediatric Orthopaedics

DR PARMANAND GUPTA Chandigarh

Orthopaedic Oncology

DR MANISH PARUTHI Mumbai

Elbow, Wrist & Hand

DR RAJ MURALI UK

Shoulder

DR AMOL TAMBE UK

Associate Editors

DR DINESH PATEL USA
DR PONKY FIRER South Africa

PROF JEGAN KRISHNAN Australia
DR GURINDER BEDI Delhi

DR RAJESH SETHI UK
DR DINSHAW PARDIWALA Mumbai

Editorial Board

PROF GIANNOUDIS UK
PROF AMAR RANGAN UK
DR KHALID MOHAMMAD New Zealand
MR KAPIL KUMAR UK
DR MAKARAM SRINIVASAN UK

DR V BHALAIK UK
DR PUNEET MONGA UK
DR TAOFEK ADEYEMI Nigeria
DR MS DHILLON Chandigarh
DR VIVEK PANDEY Karnataka

DR SUNDARARAJAN Coimbatore
DR ASHISH DEVGAN Rohtak
DR RAJU EASWARAN Delhi
DR RAHUL KHARE Delhi
DR MANIT ARORA

Advisory Board

DR ANDREAS SETTJE Germany
DR ANANT JOSHI Mumbai
DR ASHOK RAJGOPAL Gurgaon
DR ASHISH BABULKAR Pune
DR ASIT SHAH USA
DR ANIL BHAT Karnataka
MR BINOD SINGH UK
DR BINU THOMAS Tamil Nadu
DR DAVID MARTIN Australia
DR DAVID RAJAN Coimbatore
DR DENNY LIE Singapore
DR EDWARD T MAH Australia
DR GRAHAM MERCER South Australia
DR H K WONG Hong Kong

DR HIROYUKI SUGAYA Japan
DR HITESH GOPALAN Cochin
PROF J E MENDES Portugal
DR JAAP WILLEMS Holland
DR JOHN EBNEZAR Bangalore
DR JVS VIDYASAGAR Hyderabad
PROF LENNARD FUNK UK
DR MARIO PENTA South Australia
DR NICK WALLWORK South Australia
DR NIRBHAY SHAH Rajkot
DR PAOLO PALADINI Italy
DR PARAG SANCHETI Pune
DR PETER CAMPBELL Australia
PROF PP KOTWAL Delhi

PROF RAJASEKARAN Coimbatore
MR RAM VENKATESH UK
MR R PANDEY UK
PROF RAJ BAHADUR Chandigarh
MR ROBERT J GREGORY UK
DR ROHIT ARORA Austria
DR SACHIN TAPASVI Pune
DR SANJAY DESAI Mumbai
DR SANJAY GARUDE Mumbai
DR SANJAY TRIVEDI Ahmedabad
DR SRIPATHI RAO Karnataka
PROF SUDHIR KAPOOR Delhi
MR VED GOSWAMI UK
DR YOUNG LAE MOON Korea

Copyright (C) 2017, International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty. All rights reserved.

Published by Reed Elsevier India Pvt. Ltd.

No part of the publication may be transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, without written permission from the Editor-in-Chief.

Disclaimer: Although all advertising material is expected to conform to ethical (medical) standards, inclusion in the publication does not constitute a guarantee or endorsement of the quality or value of such product or of the claims made of it by its manufacturer. Please consult full prescribing information before issuing prescriptions for any products mentioned in this publication.

Printed at EIH Limited-Unit Printing Press, IMT Manesar, Gurgaon

Journal of Arthroscopy and Joint Surgery

An official publication of International Society for Knowledge for Surgeons on Arthroscopy and Arthroplasty

(ISSN: 2214-9635)

Volume 4, Number 2, May–August 2017

Table of Contents

Unicompartmental knee replacement <i>Tsuneari Takahashi, Hemant G. Pandit</i>	55
Prophylactic intrawound application of vancomycin in total knee arthroplasty <i>Kavin Khatri, Deepak Bansal, Raman Singla, Shiven Sri</i>	61
A study assessing intra-articular PRP vs PRP with HMW HA vs PRP with LMW HA in early knee osteoarthritis <i>G. Jacob, V. Shetty, S. Shetty</i>	65
A 3DCT scan based assessment of femoral tunnel placement in arthroscopic ACL reconstruction by modified transtibial and anteromedial portal technique and its relation with the functional outcome: A retrospective comparative study <i>Hrishikesh Pande, Anjan Prabhakara, C.M. Singh, Ashish Pande, Vivek Mathew, Naveen BM, Rajeev Dubey, Vivek S. Phutane, Yogesh Sharma</i>	72
Study of neuroreceptors in native ACL stump and autologous hamstring tendon graft <i>Sandeep T. George, J.V.S. Vidya Sagar, Radhaa S, Tameem Afroz</i>	79
Role of posterior tibial slope in ACL deficient Indian population <i>Arindam Mukherjee, Amit Sharma, Vipul Garg, Lalit Maini, Pushpinder Bajaj</i>	83
Role of accelerated rehabilitation versus standard rehabilitation following anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction using hamstring graft <i>Prateek Ku Gupta, Ashis Acharya, Amit Mourya, Deepesh Ameriya</i>	89
Trends in scientific publications of Indian arthroplasty surgeons over 15 years (2001–2015) <i>Pradeep Choudhari, Utkarsh Agrawal, Tanveer Shaikh</i>	94
<i>Bacillus cereus</i> : A causative organism for deep soft tissue infection to forearm following trauma <i>K. Malik-Tabassum, Y.S. Hussain, K.S. Scott, M. Farndon</i>	100



Editorial

Unicompartmental knee replacement



1. Introduction

Osteoarthritis (OA) of the knee is one of the most common causes of painful loss of mobility in middle and elderly aged population. OA is the main indication for knee joint replacement surgery. Unicompartmental knee replacement (UKR) is beneficial procedure for patient with degenerative OA which is limited in medial or lateral compartment providing reliable pain relief, improving function with significantly less morbidity and mortality as compared to total knee replacement (TKR). This editorial provides an overview of UKR, its relevance for Indian population, synopsis of results and future prospects.

2. History of UKR

The concept of UKR first dates back to Campbell who reported his preliminary results on the interposition of vitallium plates in the medial compartment of arthritic knees in 1940 which was to prevent direct bone-to-bone contact to relieve the pain.¹ This clinical trial was followed by vitallium tibial plateau prosthesis by McKeever,² and tibial plateau insert by MacIntosh from 1950th until 1960th. MacIntosh reported that overall pain relief was achieved in most patients at a mean follow-up of six years in 1967. However, migration of the implant may lead to the unsatisfactory results.³ So to overcome this problem, tibial plateau prosthesis with keel was developed by McKeever. The first modern design which had cemented polycentric metal femoral condyle articulating on flat polyethylene tibial components were St Georg (1969) and Marmor (1972).⁴ The problem with first generation modern UKR was distortion of the polyethylene followed by loosening.⁵ It led to the introduction of metal-backed tibial implants rather than all-polyethylene components. However, this meant that the thickness of the polyethylene was reduced and this contributed to problems associated with excessive wear due to the high contact stresses.

Oxford UKR (Zimmer Biomet, Bridgend, UK) was developed in 1970⁶ and was the first fully congruent mobile spacer with spherical concave femoral and flat and keeled tibial components.⁷ This concept is to make both interfaces be congruent throughout the range of knee movement to minimize polyethylene wear and reduce contact stresses between bone-implant interface

without constraint. These features of Oxford UKR phase 1 have remained unchanged up to present day. On the basis of clinical observation, good results were achieved when the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) was intact and the arthritis was located anteromedial part of the tibia and distal part of the femur.^{8,9} In 1987, Oxford UKR phase 2 was introduced along with the mill which allowed incremental bone resection to match the flexion and extension gaps intraoperatively whilst simultaneously shaping the bone to fit the implant. This system could restore not only ligament tension but also knee kinematics thus decreasing insert dislocation. Low level of polyethylene wear was observed after implantation due to the design concept of Oxford UKR and surgical technique to balance the ligament and restore the native tension. These are considered to contribute the postoperative high function and better satisfaction compared to TKR.

In 1998, Oxford UKR phase 3 was introduced and it enabled to be implanted with not an open approach with patellar dislocation but with a minimally invasive approach. Five sizes of femoral components were introduced (instead of just one) and tibial components were made side specific to reduce component overhang. The functional results of cemented phase 3 and recovery were found to be better than those of phase 1 and 2.¹²

In 2004 cementless femoral component with two pegs was introduced to reduce the incidence of physiological radiolucency around the cemented tibial components which although was asymptomatic and harmless, it did contribute to unnecessary revisions. Randomized controlled trial was conducted and similar clinical outcome (as cemented UKR) but with significant reduction in the incidence of tibial radiolucency was reported.¹⁴ Subsequently a two peg cemented femoral component was introduced and reported to work well.¹⁵

3. Indications of UKR

TKR is an effectively treatment for most types of arthritis in which both the tibio-femoral compartments were involved. On the other hand, Oxford medial UKR is indicated for the treatment of anteromedial OA (AMOA) and spontaneous osteonecrosis of the knee.¹⁶ In AMOA, there should be (1) bone-on-bone arthritis in the

medial compartment; (2) retained full thickness cartilage in the lateral compartment, best visualized on a valgus stress X-ray; (3) a functionally normal medial collateral ligament; and (4) a functionally normal ACL. The status of the patellofemoral joint (PFJ) is considered to be a contraindication only if there is a bone loss with grooving laterally.¹⁷

Various contraindications to UKR were proposed by Kozinn and Scott. The best candidates for UKR were reported to (1) patients older than 60 years of age and weigh less than 180 pounds, (2) not extremely physically active or heavy labourers, (3) preoperative knee pain should be minimal at rest, (4) have a more than 90° flexion arc, with 5° or less of flexion contracture, (5) less than 15° of angular knee deformity, limits being 10° varus to 15° valgus.¹⁸ According to these criteria, only around 6% of patients may be considered appropriate for UKR. However, candidacy for Oxford UKR is much wider accounting for 47.6% of knee arthroplasties in a series of 200 consecutive knees.¹⁵ Additionally, lateral osteophytes had been reported to be associated with lateral compartment disease and as such it was unclear whether medial UKR should be performed if present. Hamilton et al. performed the survey of the presence and size of lateral osteophytes, and their impact on clinical outcomes and Oxford UKR survival and demonstrated that the presence of lateral osteophytes is not a contraindication to medial meniscal-bearing UKR.¹⁹

4. Contraindication of UKR

Kozin and Scott's contraindications for UKR (as outlined above) were based on their experience of fixed bearing UKR. Outcome of patients with and without these potential contraindications in a prospective series of 1000 Oxford UKRs was compared.²² The outcome was assessed using the Oxford Knee Score (OKS), American Knee Society Score, Tegner activity score, revision rate and survival rate. Clinical outcome of patients with these potential contraindications were similar to or better than those without potential contraindications. The 10-year survival was 97% or those with potential contraindications and 93.6% without these contraindications. This difference maintained at 15 years as well, with implant survival of 94% in those with potential contraindications and 90% without these contraindications.

Based on these and various other observations, the contraindications for Oxford UKR are: inflammatory arthritis, absent or severely damaged ACL, PCL or MCL, partial thickness disease in the medial compartment, presence of a central ulcer in the weight bearing portion of the lateral compartment, bone loss with eburnation and grooving in the lateral part of the PFJ, and previous history of valgus tibial osteotomy.

5. Clinical results after UKR

The data from joint registries confirms that patients undergoing TKR had lower revision rates, they had higher rates of morbidity and mortality, longer hospital stays and inferior patient reported outcome measures compared with patients undergoing UKR.²³ Surgeons who perform UKR frequently significantly had lower revision rate and superior patient reported outcomes. Increasing usage of UKR leads to better results. Surgeons with optimal usage (up to 20% of knee replacements in the surgeon's practice is UKR) achieved revision or reoperation rates similar to matched patients who undergoing TKR up to eight years postoperatively and 10 year survival is reported to be about 95%.²⁴

The revision rates of the UKR are reported to be much higher in national registries than in most published studies. Most surgeons perform very small numbers of UKR and the most common number implanted per year is one or two and average is five.^{25,24} Improper patient selection, inadequate surgical usage and/or unnecessary revisions can contribute to high UKR revision rates in the National Joint Registry (NJR). Matched comparison of UKR and TKA was performed based on the NJR for England, Wales and Northern Ireland including 100,000 cases of knee arthroplasty, UKR was reported to have several advantages for example, shorter hospital stay, reduced rates of readmission, intra-operative complications and need for blood transfusion as compared with TKR.²³ Additionally, frequency of major complications such as thromboembolism, postoperative infection, stroke and myocardial infarction were also less about a quarter to half as compared with TKR thus resulting in less mortality.²³ Comparing the patient oriented outcome measures (PROMs) between matched groups of UKR and TKR postoperative OKS after 6 months was significantly better with UKR than TKR and significantly more patients after UKR achieved an excellent clinical outcome.^{26,27} Overall EuroQuol score was also better with UKR in four subscales relating to mobility, pain, function and self care.²⁸

Various cohort studies of cemented Oxford UKR have demonstrated high levels of function and excellent long-term survival rate can be achieved. In an independent study the 20-year survival was similar to the best TKR. The proposed contraindication for UKR (youth, obesity, activity, PFJ damage, and chondrocalcinosis) did not compromise the outcome. This suggests that if patients have AMOA, these proposed contraindications can be ignored. AMOA is present in about 50% of patients needing knee replacement. There is little evidence as to the optimal usage with the fixed bearing. However, there is a report that the fixed bearing should not be used with significant PF joint problems.²⁹

6. Complication after UKR

Complication rate after UKR is reported to be lower than that after TKR. Revision surgery after UKR tend to be much easier than that after TKA because latter one needs may be much more invasive to the patients. In the long term, the commonest cause of failure is progression of arthritis in the lateral compartment although incidence is not high.

6.1. Infection

The incidence of infection after UKR is about half of that after TKR.³⁰ C-reactive protein (CRP) or erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) are the most useful diagnostic test but may not be positive in the first 2–3 weeks. Acute infection is diagnosed and treated in the same way as TKR. Early open debridement and change of meniscal bearing and intravenous antibiotics can arrest the infection and save the arthroplasty. Arthroscopic irrigation is not recommended. The earliest radiological sign may be in the retained compartment in the form of thinning of the articular cartilage and juxta-articular erosion of the non-implanted joint or progressive radiolucency line may occur around the tibial component. Treatment should include removal of the implant and excision of the inflammatory membrane followed by one or two staged revision TKR.

6.2. Medial tibial plateau fracture

In the NJR, 0.30 revisions for periprosthetic fracture per 1000 years after UKR are reported.³¹ This did not include cases undergoing internal fixation so incidence may be underestimated. Periprosthetic fractures tend to occur in the hands of inexperienced surgeons both with cement and cementless implants. It mainly occurs intraoperatively or around 2–12 weeks after surgery. Weakening of the condyle by removal of its articular surface and subchondral bone plate is probably the main reason for fracture. This is unavoidable in UKR, so great care should be taken not to add any additional damage to the bones. The most potent case of that fracture is damage to posterior tibial cortex and the cancellous bone when using vertical saw blade that goes deeper than needed. Management of the tibial plateau fracture depends on the stage at which the fracture is diagnosed and the degree of varus deformity. If the fracture is diagnosed at the time of arthroplasty, it should be reduced and internally fixed. After the fixation, UKR can be completed and good result is expected.³² If the medial fragment is comminuted, it should be fixed using buttress plate.

6.3. Dislocation of a mobile bearing

In the NJR, the incidence of the dislocation of a mobile bearing is reported to be 1.2 revisions for dislocation/subluxation per 1000 component years (95% CI 1.05–1.37) for mobile bearing UKR. Most dislocation occur early postoperative periods and incidence of dislocation using phase 3 Oxford UKR is reported 0.73% in a meta-analysis.³³ Primary dislocation is usually caused by a combination of distraction of the joint and displacement of the bearing due to impingement. They are usually due to surgical error. Secondary dislocation is the result of loss of entrapment from loosening and subsidence of the metal components. Spontaneous elongation of ligaments does not occur unless there is impingement, when forced flexion or extension may stretch ligaments. Traumatic dislocation is sometimes encountered when a normally functioning Oxford UKR has been forced into an extreme posture and MCL has been stretched or damaged.

To diagnose the dislocation, radiographs demonstrate the site of the displaced bearing, and may suggest its cause such as osteophytes, retained cement, or displacement of a metal component. The dislocated bearing is most commonly found in the anterior joint space because the anterior rim of the bearing is higher than its posterior rim. Manual reduction under anesthesia succeeds on a few occasions. However, arthrotomy is almost always required to remove the bearing and determine the cause of its displacement. When the both metal components are fixed to the bones, any bone or cement might impinge on the bearing. After removing these, usually one thicker bearing should be inserted to tighten the ligaments. In case of recurrent dislocation, MCL dysfunction, or serious mid flexion gap, conversion to TKR should be performed because revision of failed UKR to another UKR was reported to results less successful by Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Registry.³⁴

6.4. Loosening of a fixed component

Loosening of the component is one of the commonest causes of failure in the national registries. The rate of loosening is 4.01 (CI 3.73–4.32) per 1000 patient years in the NJR.³¹ To diagnose the loosening, the only reliable radiographic evidence is the

displacement of a metal component: for example, a loose tibial component may tilt or femoral component may rotate (as compared with serial radiographs). Stable radiolucency at the bone-cement interface is common and it does not indicate the evidence of loosening. Femoral component loosening is difficult to diagnose because of the difficulty to see radiolucency on the X-rays.³⁵ Radionuclide bone scan is not recommended because there is increase of uptake under the tibial component last for many years which indicates remodeling. The cause of early failures are mainly result of poor initial fixation. Late tibial loosening may be due to the accumulated effects of impact loading from impingement of the front of the bearing on the femoral condyle in full extension.³⁶ In early loosening without seriously eroded bone, cementing a new component is a possible option however, in late loosening with extensively eroded bone, revision to TKR is better.

6.5. Lateral compartment arthritis

In a series of 1000 cases of Phase 3 Oxford UKR with 15 years follow up, lateral OA progression that required revision occurred in 2.5% at a mean follow up of 7 years.³⁷ To diagnose the lateral compartment arthritis, pain which is not always on the lateral side is the main symptom. Narrowing of the lateral compartment joint space occurred first and this may long precede the onset of pain. Subchondral sclerosis and disappearance of lateral joint space ensue. Osteophyte of the lateral compartment is not portend progressive arthritis. Overcorrection of the varus deformity into valgus is an important cause of progression of lateral OA. So intact MCL is of importance so that overcorrection is avoided. If the symptom persists after conservative treatment, revision to TKR is indicated, however some surgeons may choose to perform lateral UKR in case medial UKR remains satisfactory.

6.6. Pain

Pain can be a problem and often leads to unnecessary revision. Pain can be encountered over the proximal tibia. This type of pain is not unusual in the first six months after surgery and usually settles spontaneously. The incidence is about 2% at one year after surgery.³⁸ The causes of pain after UKR may be multifactorial. Inappropriate indications or bone overload are the most common causes.^{39,40} Impingement, soft tissue irritation, cementing errors, pes anserinus bursitis or neuroma have been implicated.

6.7. Partial thickness cartilage loss (PTCL)

It is generally thought that UKR is best used in young patients with early arthritis. However, Oxford UKR only should be offered to patients with bone-on-bone arthritis because cadaveric studies have shown that asymptomatic PTCL is common.⁴¹ So if a patient has pain and PTCL, PTCL is not necessarily the cause of pain.

6.8. Component overhang

Medial tibial overhang of more than 3 mm was associated with pain and poor function that tended to get worse postoperatively. This may be due to soft tissue irritation. The tibial component increases in size parametrically by 2 mm so overhang of 2 mm or more can be avoided by selecting the appropriate component size or performing the vertical cut again further laterally. Also anteromedial femoral component overhang may cause pain.⁴²

7. Investigations

Radiographs are the most useful and AP radiographs aligned with the tibial component should be obtained at the first and subsequent follow ups. Physiological radiolucencies must be ignored because they are not source of pain.⁴³ If femoral component loosening is suspected, lateral views of 0 and 90 degrees should be obtained and examined the movement of the component.³⁵ Radionuclide bone scans are not helpful and often misleading. Even if patient is asymptomatic, they are hot lesions for many years. If the pain is located laterally, MRI scan is useful to identify meniscal tear. An ultrasound aspiration can be useful to exclude infection. Arthroscopy is useful only when lateral meniscal lesions, cement loose bodies, impingement or chondral flaps in the PFJ are suspected.

7.1. Treatment of unexplained pain

Early revision because of pain should be avoided because most patients revised for unexplained pain, could not recover from pain. For example, 75% of patients who were revised to TKR and had no mechanical problems identified at surgery had no improvement of symptoms.³⁶ Patients should be treated conservatively as their pain tends to settle spontaneously. Patients should be informed they are likely to have some pain for three to six months and that there is a small chance that it may take one to two years to fully settle. If patients have pain, they should decrease their level of activity and use a walking clutch. Steroid injection is recommended if the pain is focal.

7.2. Limited motion

Knee movements are usually recovered rapidly after surgery. However, occasionally manipulation under anesthesia has been employed if the knee has not recovered 90° of knee flexion at six weeks after surgery. In these cases, unlike manipulation of a stiff joint after TKR, there are no adhesions in the suprapatellar pouch and the knee flexes fully when a little force was applied. Extension improves spontaneously after Oxford UKR and rarely lacks more than 3° of knee extension at one year after surgery. If a flexion contracture persists, it is usually because osteophytes in the roof of the notch or on the tibia in front of the ACL insertion that have not been resected at the time of surgery.

7.3. Implant failure

There are some cases of fractures of Oxford UKR bearing.^{32,44} Fractures often occur with the thinnest (3.5 mm) bearings and is associated with impingement that results in increasing wear. Treatment should be done by replacement with a new bigger bearing and addressing impingement.

7.4. Results of revision surgery

The re-revision rate after a UKR to UKR revision is higher than a UKR to TKA revision. Therefore, UKR to TKR revision is generally recommended. However certain circumstances when a UKR to UKR revision should be considered for example, replacing a bearing for a dislocation; a lateral or medial UKR for disease progression; and loosening with minimal bone loss that needs implanting a new component. If there is a mechanical cause for the failure such as disease progression component loosening, recurrent dislocation, or damage to deep fiber of MCL, conversion

for TKR should be considered. The results of the revision surgery tend to be as good as those of a primary TKR. However, if there is no mechanical cause of pain, the results are poor. The typical case is a patient with early OA and partial thickness cartilage loss treated with UKR. Then, UKR does not relieve the pain and surgeons misinterpret the physiological radiolucency as indication revision TKR for loosening.

If there is a severe bone loss due to tibial plateau fracture, infection and deep tibial resection with ligament instability, revision TKA should be performed with stem and augment which increase constraint.^{45,46}

8. Lateral UKR

Lateral UKR is a relatively rare and said to account for about one eighth of all unicompartmental OA.⁴⁷ To identify lateral OA reliably, either a valgus stress radiograph in 45° of knee flexion or a Rosenberg view is necessary.

8.1. Anatomy and kinematics

The stabilizing effect of the LCL is quite different from MCL. MCL provides stability throughout the knee movement and therefore dislocation of the mobile bearing is rare. Conversely, LCL is tight only in knee extension and in 90 degrees of knee flexion, 5–10 mm distraction is possible in the lateral compartment.⁴⁹ So dislocation of the mobile bearing is a potential problem in mobile bearing lateral UKR.

8.2. History and development of lateral Oxford UKR

The results of lateral arthroplasty have been marred by dislocation of the bearing.

So it was recommended not to use mobile bearing into the lateral side but to use fixed bearing.

9. Indications

Requirement on the indications for successful lateral UKR are: Bone-on-bone OA in the lateral compartment. There should be a full thickness cartilage in the medial compartment and correctable intra-articular deformity. This is best demonstrated by a varus stress radiograph.

Like the medial UKR, age, activity, obesity and chondrocalcinosis would be ignored.

Due to the high dislocation rate of the mobile bearing, using the fixed bearing components is recommended for surgeons. Recently Fixed Lateral Oxford (FLO) prosthesis is introduced and used with the same instrumentation.

There have been some independent studies of the domed lateral UKR, which have confirmed good results.^{50,51} Use of the modified surgical technique and new design with a domed tibial component appears to reduce the early dislocation rate. However, it is still higher than in the medial compartment. Knees that dislocated tended to be overcorrected compared with those that did not dislocate. To avoid the overcorrection, selecting the bearing thickness that just tightens the ligaments in full extension and the size of the gap between the femoral and tibial components should be minimized.⁵²

Dislocations commonly occur medially over the wall of the tibial component. Usually the bearing dislocation is not reduced by manipulation and the bearing should be retrieved under direct vision through old incisions. Care should be taken to identify any

potential causes of bearing dislocation such as impingement, component loosening, bow stringing of popliteus or ligament injury. Dislocation is addressed when new thicker bearing is inserted but sometimes occurs.

10. Indian perspective

Indian patients have high prevalence AMOA and are well suited to receive Oxford UKR provided the indications are correct and surgical technique is optimal. Small components are usually needed and careful attention to prevent posterior tibial blow out is crucial. Patients with tibia vara tend to perform well with Oxford UKR although at present the follow up is up to 10 years.

Careful documentation of surgical findings, close patient follow up and data sharing will help improve outcomes of Oxford UKR in the Indian scenario and it seems that in the past two to three years there is increasing recognition amongst surgeons that indeed UKR does work and Indian patients will benefit with it due to associated reduced morbidity, better function and ability to sit cross legged and squat after Oxford UKR.

References

- Campbell WC. Interposition of Vitallium plates in arthroplasties of the knee: preliminary report. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1976;4:6-.
- McKeever DC. The classic: tibial plateau prosthesis.1960. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2005;440:4–8 discussion 3.
- MacIntosh DL, Hunter GA. The use of the hemiarthroplasty prosthesis for advanced osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis of the knee. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1972;54:244–255.
- Marmor L. Unicompartmental and total knee arthroplasty. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1985;7:5–81.
- Marmor L. The Modular (Marmor) knee: case report with a minimum follow-up of 2 years. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1976;86:94-.
- Goodfellow JW, O'Connor J. Clinical results of the Oxford knee. Surface arthroplasty of the tibiofemoral joint with a meniscal bearing prosthesis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1986;2:1–42.
- Goodfellow J, O'Connor J. The anterior cruciate ligament in knee arthroplasty. A risk-factor with unconstrained meniscal prostheses. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 1992;24:5–252.
- White SH, Ludkowski PF, Goodfellow JW. Anteromedial osteoarthritis of the knee. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1991;73:582–586.
- Price AJ, Webb J, Topf H, et al. Rapid recovery after oxford unicompartmental arthroplasty through a short incision. *J Arthroplasty.* 2001;16:970–976.
- Liddle AD, Pandit H, O'Brien S, et al. Cementless fixation in Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement: a multicentre study of 1000 knees. *Bone Joint J.* 2013;95-B:181–187.10.1302/0301-620X.95B2.30411.
- White SH, Roberts S, Jones PW. The Twin Peg Oxford partial knee replacement: the first 100 cases. *Knee.* 2012;19:36–40.10.1016/j.knee.2010.12.006.
- Pandit H, Jenkins C, Barker K, Dodd CA, Murray DW. The Oxford medial unicompartmental knee replacement using a minimally-invasive approach. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2006;88:54–60.10.1302/0301-620X.88B1.17114.
- Beard DJ, Pandit H, Ostlere S, et al. Pre-operative clinical and radiological assessment of the patellofemoral joint in unicompartmental knee replacement and its influence on outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2007;89:1602–1607.10.1302/0301-620X.89B12.19260.
- Kozinn SC, Marx C, Scott RD. Unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. A 4.5–6-year follow-up study with a metal-backed tibial component. *J Arthroplasty.* 1989;4(Suppl):S1–10.
- Hamilton TW, Choudhary R, Jenkins C, et al. Lateral osteophytes do not represent a contraindication to medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a 15-year follow-up. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc.* 2017;25:652–659.10.1007/s00167-016-4313-9.
- Hamilton TW, et al. Evidence-based indications for mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty in a consecutive cohort of thousand knees. *J Arthroplasty.* 2017;32(Jun (6)):1779–1785.10.1016/j.arth.2016.12.036.
- Liddle AD, Judge A, Pandit H, Murray DW. Adverse outcomes after total and unicompartmental knee replacement in 101,330 matched patients: a study of data from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *Lancet.* 2014;384:1437–1445.10.1016/S0140-6736(14)60419-0.
- Goodfellow J, O'Connor J, Pandit H, et al. *Unicompartmental arthroplasty with the oxford knee.* 2nd edition Goodfellow Publishers Lim; 2016.
- Liddle AD, University of Oxford. *Failure of unicompartmental knee replacement.* .
- Kalairajah Y, Azurza K, Hulme C, Mollay S, 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.* 2005;20:1037–1041.10.1016/j.arth.2005.04.017.
- Goodfellow JW, O'Connor JJ, Murray DW. A critique of revision rate as an outcome measure: re-interpretation of knee joint registry data. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2010;92:1628–1631.10.1302/0301-620X.92B12.25193.
- Liddle AD, Pandit H, Judge A, Murray DW. Patient-reported outcomes after total and unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a study of 14,076 matched patients from the National Joint Registry for England and Wales. *Bone Joint J.* 2015;97-B:793–801.10.1302/0301-620X.97B6.35155.
- Argenson JN, Blanc G, Aubaniac JM, Parratte S. Modern unicompartmental knee arthroplasty with cement: a concise follow-up, at a mean of twenty years, of a previous report. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2013;95:905–909.10.2106/JBJS.L.00963.
- Liddle AD, Judge A, Pandit H, Murray DW. Determinants of revision and functional outcome following unicompartmental knee replacement. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2014;22:1241–1250.10.1016/j.joca.2014.07.006.
- Board TN. *Annual report of the National Joint Registry for England Wales Northern Ireland.* .
- Berger RA, Meneghini RM, Jacobs JJ, et al. Results of unicompartmental knee arthroplasty at a minimum of ten years of follow-up. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2005;87:999–1006.10.2106/JBJS.C.00568.
- Pandit H, Jenkins C, Gill HS, et al. Minimally invasive Oxford phase 3 unicompartmental knee replacement: results of 1000 cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2011;93:198–204.10.1302/0301-620X.93B2.25767.
- Hang JR, Stanford TE, Graves SE, et al. Outcome of revision of unicompartmental knee replacement. *Acta Orthop.* 2010;81:95–98.10.3109/17453671003628731.
- Monk AP, Keys GW, Murray DW. Loosening of the femoral component after unicompartmental knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2009;91:405–407.10.1302/0301-620X.91B3.21940.
- Psychoyios V, Crawford RW, O'Connor JJ, Murray DW. Wear of congruent meniscal bearings in unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a retrieval study of 16 specimens. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 1998;80:972–982.
- Pandit H, Hamilton TW, Jenkins C, et al. The clinical outcome of minimally invasive Phase 3 Oxford unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a 15-year follow-up of 1000 UKAs. *Bone Joint J.* 2015;97-B:1493–1500.10.1302/0301-620X.97B11.35634.
- Gulati A, University of Oxford. *Outcome after medial unicompartmental knee replacement.* .
- Small SR, Berend ME, Ritter MA, Buckley CA. Bearing mobility affects tibial strain in mobile-bearing unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Surg Technol Int.* 2010;19:185–190.
- Pegg EC, Walter J, Mellon SJ, et al. Evaluation of factors affecting tibial bone strain after unicompartmental knee replacement. *J Orthop Res.* 2013;31:821–828.10.1002/jor.22283.
- Emery IH, Meachim G. Surface morphology and topography of patello-femoral cartilage fibrillation in Liverpool necropsies. *J Anat.* 1973;116:103–120.
- Chau R, Gulati A, Pandit H, et al. Tibial component overhang following unicompartmental knee replacement—does it matter? *Knee.* 2009;16:310–313.10.1016/j.knee.2008.12.017.
- Gulati A, Chau R, Pandit H, et al. The incidence of physiological radiolucency following Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement and its relationship to outcome. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2009;91:896–902.10.1302/0301-620X.91B7.21914.
- Tibrewal S, Pandit H, McLardy-Smith P, Tibrewal SB, Murray DW. Posterior dislocation of the Oxford knee meniscal bearing: a treatment option. *J Orthop Traumatol.* 2014;15:59–62.10.1007/s10195-013-0250-2.
- Wynn Jones H, Chan W, Harrison T, et al. Revision of medial Oxford unicompartmental knee replacement to a total knee replacement: similar to a primary? *Knee.* 2012;19:339–343.10.1016/j.knee.2011.03.006.
- Jamali AA, Scott RD. Lateral unicompartmental knee arthroplasty. *Techniques in Knee Surgery.* 2005;4:79–88.
- Tokuhara Y, Kadoya Y, Nakagawa S, Kobayashi A, Takaoka K. The flexion gap in normal knees. An MRI study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2004;86:1133–1136.
- Streit MR, Walker T, Bruckner T, et al. Mobile-bearing lateral unicompartmental knee replacement with the Oxford domed tibial component: an independent series. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2012;94:1356–1361.10.1302/0301-620X.94B10.29119.
- Weston-Simons JS, Pandit H, Kendrick BJ, et al. The mid-term outcomes of the Oxford Domed Lateral unicompartmental knee replacement. *Bone Joint J.* 2014;96-B:59–64.10.1302/0301-620X.96B1.31630.
- Robinson BJ, Rees JL, Price AJ, et al. Dislocation of the bearing of the Oxford lateral unicompartmental arthroplasty. A radiological assessment. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* 2002;84:653–657.

Tsuneari Takahashi^{a,b,*}

^aLeeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, University of Leeds, Leeds, UK

^bDepartment of Orthopedic Surgery, Jichi Medical University, Shimotsuke, Japan

Hemant G. Pandit
*Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, Uni-
versity of Leeds, Leeds, UK*

E-mail addresses: tsuneari9@jichi.ac.jp (T. Takahashi),
H.Pandit@leeds.ac.uk (H. Pandit).

Received 28 June 2017

* Corresponding author at: 2nd Floor, Chapel Allerton Hospital,
Chapeltown Road, Leeds, LS7 4SA, UK.

Available online 16 August 2017



To read all articles of this issue, you must be a member of ISKSAA.

**If you are already a member of
ISKSAA then please login to access the full issue.**



Scopus

The database with an eye on global research

60 million records | 22,000 titles | 5,000 Publishers

Search with confidence across:

-  Life Sciences
-  Health Sciences
-  Physical Sciences
-  Technology
-  Social Sciences
-  Arts & Humanities

Register now to take advantage of customized features and services.

www.elsevier.com/scopus



ELSEVIER

XYATA LIFESCIENCES LTD.
HONG KONG
www.xyata.hk



XYATA LIFESCIENCES PVT. LTD.
INDIA
www.xyata.in

offers the highly specialized range



FOR OSTEOARTHRITIS MANAGEMENT

Cross Linked

BIOVISC

ORTHO SINGLE PFS

Hyaluronic Acid Inj. 3ml (90mg / 3ml)

Optimum Volume, Sustained Effect



High Molecular Weight

HYNEES[®]

PFS

Sodium Hyaluronate Inj. 2ml (10mg / ml)

For effective management of osteoarthritis



FOR OSTEOPOROSIS MANAGEMENT

Recombinant Human Parathyroid Hormone (1-34)

ELEVOSTEO[®]

Teriparatide Injection (rDNA origin)

ELEVATING OSTEOGENESIS



ZOLVOID[®]

Zoledronic Acid Infusion 5mg/100ml

The **GOLD STANDARD** in Osteoporosis Treatment



For Comprehensive Mobility Solutions

A WHO - GMP Certified Company

NATIONAL TOLL FREE HELPLINE: 1800 1111 55

An ISO : 9001 - 2008 Certified Company