Commentary

iMedPub Journals
www.imedpub.com

Journal of Clinical & Experimental Orthopedics
ISSN 2471-8416

2025
Vol.11 No.1: 316

Comparative Outcomes of Robotic-assisted *vs.* Conventional Total Knee Arthroplasty

Andrew Mitchell*

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA

Corresponding author: Andrew Mitchell, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN, USA, E-mail: andrew.mitchell@ser.edu

Received date: February 03, 2025, Manuscript No. ipjceop-25-20800; **Editor assigned date:** February 05, 2025, PreQC No. ipjceop-25-20800 (PQ); **Reviewed date:** February 17, 2025, QC No. ipjceop-25-20800; **Revised date:** February 22, 2025, Manuscript No. ipjceop-25-20800 (R); **Published date:** February 28, 2025, DOI: 10.36648/2471-8416.11.1.316

Citation: Mitchell A (2025) Comparative Outcomes of Robotic-assisted *vs.* Conventional Total Knee Arthroplasty. J Clin Exp Orthopr Vol.11 No.1: 316.

Introduction

Total knee arthroplasty is one of the most successful orthopedic procedures for relieving pain and restoring function in patients with advanced knee osteoarthritis. Conventional techniques, though widely practiced, are associated with challenges in achieving optimal implant alignment, soft tissue balance, and long-term functional outcomes. In recent years, robotic-assisted total knee arthroplasty has emerged as an innovative approach that utilizes advanced imaging, computer navigation, and robotic precision to improve surgical accuracy. Comparing the outcomes of RA-TKA and conventional TKA is essential for evaluating the clinical benefits, cost-effectiveness, and future role of robotic technology in orthopedic surgery. Robotic-assisted TKA offers enhanced precision in bone preparation and implant positioning. The use of real-time intraoperative imaging and robotic guidance allows surgeons to achieve alignment within tighter tolerances compared to conventional jig-based methods. This precise execution is believed to reduce the risk of malalignment, a key factor in implant loosening and revision surgery. Conventional TKA, though effective, relies heavily on the surgeon's experience and visual assessment, which can introduce variability [1].

Description

Functional outcomes represent a critical measure of success in knee replacement surgery. Several clinical studies have shown that patients undergoing RA-TKA may experience improved early functional recovery, including faster regaining of range of motion, reduced pain scores, and greater satisfaction in the immediate postoperative period. However, long-term functional differences between the two methods remain less clear, with some studies reporting comparable outcomes after one to two years. A significant advantage of RA-TKA lies in its ability to optimize soft tissue balance. By allowing surgeons to adjust implant positioning based on individual patient anatomy and ligament tension, robotic systems minimize the need for extensive soft tissue releases [2].

Complication rates also merit close evaluation. Robotic-assisted procedures have demonstrated a lower incidence of outliers in component alignment and fewer technical errors. However, they are not entirely without risks. Issues such as longer operative times, equipment-related failures, and the learning curve associated with robotic systems can pose challenges. In contrast, conventional TKA is generally faster, widely accessible, and familiar to most orthopedic surgeons, though alignment accuracy may be less consistent [3].

Revision rates following TKA are a major determinant of long-term success. Early evidence suggests that the superior alignment and soft tissue balance achieved with RA-TKA could translate into lower revision rates over time. However, given the relatively recent adoption of robotic systems, long-term comparative data are still limited. Conventional TKA, with decades of outcome data, continues to demonstrate durable results in the majority of patients. Patient satisfaction is another important metric. Studies indicate that patients who undergo RA-TKA often report higher satisfaction, particularly regarding perceived joint function and natural feel of the knee. This may be attributed to more accurate anatomical restoration and reduced soft tissue trauma. Nevertheless, conventional TKA still delivers high satisfaction rates overall, especially when performed by experienced surgeons [4].

The economic aspect of robotic technology remains a point of debate. RA-TKA involves higher upfront costs due to expensive robotic systems, maintenance, and training requirements. While improved accuracy and potential reduction in revisions could offset costs in the long term, current economic analyses show mixed results. Conventional TKA remains more cost-effective in most healthcare settings, particularly in resource-limited regions. The learning curve for RA-TKA also influences outcomes. Surgeons must undergo specialized training to maximize the benefits of robotic systems, and operative times are typically longer during the initial phase. Over time, efficiency improves, but this learning curve may limit widespread adoption in centers with high surgical volumes and resource constraints [5].

© Copyright iMedPub | This article is available from: https://orthopedics.imedpub.com/

Conclusion

The comparison between robotic-assisted and conventional total knee arthroplasty underscores both the promise and limitations of technological innovation in orthopedic surgery. Robotic-assisted TKA offers superior precision in implant alignment, better soft tissue balance, and improved short-term functional outcomes, with potential long-term benefits still under investigation. Conventional TKA remains highly effective, with established durability, lower costs, and broad accessibility. Ultimately, the choice between the two approaches should be individualized, taking into account patient characteristics, surgeon expertise, and healthcare resources. As evidence continues to evolve, robotic-assisted surgery is likely to play an expanding role, complementing rather than replacing conventional TKA in the pursuit of optimal patient outcomes.

Acknowledgement

None.

Conflict of Interest

None.

References

1. Clement ND, Weir D, Holland J, Gerrand C, Deehan DJ. (2019). Meaningful changes in the short form 12 physical and mental summary scores after total knee arthroplasty. The Knee 26: 861-868.

2. Kayani B, Fontalis A, Haddad IC, Donovan C, Rajput V, et al. (2023). Robotic-arm assisted total knee arthroplasty is associated with comparable functional outcomes but improved forgotten joint scores compared with conventional manual total knee arthroplasty at five-year follow-up. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc 31: 5453-5462.

3. Khlopas A, Sodhi N, Hozack WJ, Chen AF, Mahoney OM, et al. (2020). Patient-reported functional and satisfaction outcomes after robotic-arm-assisted total knee arthroplasty: Early results of a prospective multicenter investigation. J Knee Surg 33: 685-690.

4. Song EK, Seon JK, Yim JH, Netravali NA, Bargar WL. (2013). Robotic-assisted TKA reduces postoperative alignment outliers and improves gap balance compared to conventional TKA. Clin Orthop Relat Res 471: 118-126.

5. Richards JA, Williams MD, Gupta NA, Kitchen JM, Whitaker JE, et al. (2022). No difference in PROMs between robotic-assisted CR *vs*. PS total knee arthroplasty: A preliminary study. J Robot Surg 16: 1209-1217.

© Copyright iMedPub | This article is available from: https://orthopedics.imedpub.com/