

E.Motion (cementless)/E.Motion Pro (cemented) Total Knee Investigation

Note: This analysis compares the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) femoral/tibial combination with all other total knee prostheses.

This combination has been identified as having a significantly higher rate of revision. For a detailed explanation of the process used by the Registry that results in identification of prostheses that have a higher than anticipated rate of revision please refer to the Prostheses with Higher than Anticipated Rates of Revision chapter of the most recent AOANJRR Annual Report, <https://aoanjrr.sahmri.com/annual-reports-2026>.

Note: Procedures using prostheses with no recorded use in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 1

Revision Rate of Primary Total Knee Replacement

The revision rate of the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination is compared to all other total knee prostheses.

Table 1: Revision Rates of Primary Total Knee Replacement

Component	N Revised	N Total	Obs. Years	Revisions/100 Obs. Yrs (95% CI)
E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	11	205	934	1.18 (0.59, 2.11)
Other Total Knee	27273	791225	5144987	0.53 (0.52, 0.54)
TOTAL	27284	791430	5145922	0.53 (0.52, 0.54)

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 2

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Knee Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination is compared to all other total knee prostheses.

Table 2: Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision (95% CI) of Primary Total Knee Replacement

CPR	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs
E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	2.0 (0.7, 5.1)	3.5 (1.7, 7.2)	4.7 (2.5, 8.9)	6.3 (3.5, 11.3)	6.3 (3.5, 11.3)	6.3 (3.5, 11.3)
Other Total Knee	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	1.8 (1.8, 1.8)	2.4 (2.3, 2.4)	2.8 (2.7, 2.8)	3.1 (3.1, 3.1)	3.4 (3.4, 3.5)

CPR	7 Yrs	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs	11 Yrs	12 Yrs
E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)						
Other Total Knee	3.7 (3.7, 3.8)	4.0 (4.0, 4.1)	4.3 (4.3, 4.4)	4.6 (4.6, 4.7)	4.9 (4.9, 5.0)	5.3 (5.2, 5.3)

CPR	13 Yrs	14 Yrs	15 Yrs	16 Yrs	17 Yrs	18 Yrs
E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)						
Other Total Knee	5.6 (5.5, 5.7)	5.9 (5.8, 6.0)	6.3 (6.2, 6.4)	6.7 (6.6, 6.9)	7.2 (7.0, 7.3)	7.5 (7.4, 7.7)

CPR	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs	22 Yrs	23 Yrs	24 Yrs	25 Yrs
E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)							
Other Total Knee	7.8 (7.7, 8.0)	8.1 (7.9, 8.3)	8.5 (8.2, 8.7)	8.7 (8.4, 9.0)	8.8 (8.6, 9.2)	9.1 (8.7, 9.5)	9.5 (8.8, 10.2)

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.


FIGURE 1

Yearly Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Knee Replacement

The yearly cumulative percent revision of the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination is compared to all other total knee prostheses. In addition, hazard ratios are reported.

Hazard ratios are reported for specific time periods during which the hazard ratio is constant. This is done to enable more specific and valid comparisons of the risk of revision over time. The pattern of variation in risk has important implications with respect to the underlying reasons for any difference.

Figure 1: Cumulative Percent Revision of Primary Total Knee Replacement



Number at Risk	0 Yr	1 Yr	2 Yrs	3 Yrs	4 Yrs	5 Yrs	6 Yrs	7 Yrs
E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	205	201	173	140	116	89	55	34
Other Total Knee	791225	708498	628101	550695	487428	424779	369790	315965

Number at Risk	8 Yrs	9 Yrs	10 Yrs	11 Yrs	12 Yrs	13 Yrs	14 Yrs	15 Yrs	16 Yrs
E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	10	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	0
Other Total Knee	266806	222314	182649	146979	117201	92187	70380	52526	38351

Number at Risk	17 Yrs	18 Yrs	19 Yrs	20 Yrs	21 Yrs	22 Yrs	23 Yrs	24 Yrs	25 Yrs
E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other Total Knee	27628	19434	13616	9427	6164	3657	2096	972	244

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 3**Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Total Knee Replacement**

This table identifies the diagnosis of the primary procedure which was subsequently revised. This information is provided as there is a variation on outcome depending on the primary diagnosis. It is therefore important when considering the reasons for a higher than anticipated rate of revision that there is identification of the primary diagnosis. This information should be compared to the primary diagnosis for the revisions of all other total knee prostheses.

Table 3: Primary Diagnosis for Revised Primary Total Knee Replacement

Primary Diagnosis	E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)		Other Total Knee	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Osteoarthritis	11	100.0	26381	96.7
Rheumatoid Arthritis			330	1.2
Tumour			199	0.7
Other Inflammatory Arthritis			177	0.6
Osteonecrosis			104	0.4
Fracture			55	0.2
Other			26	0.1
Chondrocalcinosis			1	0.0
TOTAL	11	100.0	27273	100.0

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 4

Reasons for Revision

This is reported in two ways: a percentage of primary procedures revised and as a percentage of all revision procedures.

% Primaries Revised: This shows the proportional contribution of each revision diagnosis as a percentage of the total number of primary procedures. This percentage can be used to approximate the risk of being revised for that diagnosis. Differing percentages between groups, with the same distribution of follow up time, may identify problems of concern.

% Revisions: The number of revisions for each diagnosis is expressed as a percentage of the total number of revisions. This shows the distribution of reasons for revision within a group but cannot be used as a comparison between groups.

Table 4: Primary Total Knee Replacement - Reason for Revision (Follow-up Limited to 11.9 Years)

Revision Diagnosis	E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)			Other Total Knee		
	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions	Number	% Primaries Revised	% Revisions
Infection	3	1.5	27.3	7664	1.0	29.8
Loosening	5	2.4	45.5	5394	0.7	20.9
Instability				2770	0.4	10.8
Patella Erosion	1	0.5	9.1	1826	0.2	7.1
Pain				1784	0.2	6.9
Patellofemoral Pain				1486	0.2	5.8
Arthrofibrosis	1	0.5	9.1	1168	0.1	4.5
Fracture				1009	0.1	3.9
Malalignment	1	0.5	9.1	504	0.1	2.0
Wear Tibial Insert				254	0.0	1.0
Lysis				240	0.0	0.9
Incorrect Sizing				217	0.0	0.8
Patella Maltracking				191	0.0	0.7
Implant Breakage Tibial Insert				179	0.0	0.7
Bearing Dislocation				145	0.0	0.6
Implant Breakage Patella				142	0.0	0.6
Metal Related Pathology				107	0.0	0.4
Prosthesis Dislocation				76	0.0	0.3
Synovitis				63	0.0	0.2
Osteonecrosis				51	0.0	0.2
Wear Patella				43	0.0	0.2
Implant Breakage Tibial				37	0.0	0.1
Implant Breakage Femoral				36	0.0	0.1
Tumour				34	0.0	0.1
Heterotopic Bone				14	0.0	0.1
Progression Of Disease				7	0.0	0.0
Wear Tibial				5	0.0	0.0
Patella Dislocation				3	0.0	0.0
Incorrect Side				1	0.0	0.0
Wear Femoral				1	0.0	0.0
Other				310	0.0	1.2
N Revision	11	5.4	100.0	25761	3.3	100.0
N Primary	205			791225		

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 11.9 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

FIGURE 2**Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis of Primary Total Knee Replacement**

This figure details the cumulative incidence of the most common reasons for revision. The five most common reasons for revision are included as long as each of these reasons account for more than 10 procedures or at least 5% of all revisions for the E.Motion (class)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination. A comparative graph is provided of the cumulative incidence for the same reasons for revisions for all other total knee prostheses.


Figure 2: Cumulative Incidence Revision Diagnosis for Primary Total Knee Replacement

TABLE 5

Type of Revision Performed for Primary Total Knee Replacement

This analysis identifies the components used in the revision of the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination and compares it to the components used in the revision of all other total knee prostheses.

The reason this analysis is undertaken is to identify whether there is one or more components which are being replaced that differ from the components replaced for revisions of all other total knee prostheses i.e. is there a difference in the type of revision undertaken for the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination compared to all other total knee prostheses.

Table 5: Primary Total Knee Replacement - Type of Revision (Follow-up Limited to 11.9 Years)

Type of Revision	E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)		Other Total Knee	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
TKR (Tibial/Femoral)	4	36.4	6124	23.8
Tibial Component			1873	7.3
Femoral Component	1	9.1	1282	5.0
Cement Spacer	2	18.2	1102	4.3
Removal of Prostheses			130	0.5
Total Femoral			20	0.1
Reinsertion of Components			8	0.0
N Major	7	63.6	10539	40.9
Insert Only	2	18.2	8290	32.2
Patella Only	2	18.2	4326	16.8
Insert/Patella			2531	9.8
Minor Components			65	0.3
Cement Only			10	0.0
N Minor	4	36.4	15222	59.1
TOTAL	11	100.0	25761	100.0

Note: This table is restricted to revisions within 11.9 years for all groups to allow a time-matched comparison of revisions.

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 6**Revision Rates of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Fixation**

This analysis is provided as some prostheses have more than one fixation option. Additionally there are prostheses where an alternative to the recommended approach to fixation was used e.g. a cementless prosthesis that has been cemented or vice-versa.

Table 6: Revised Number of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Fixation

Fixation	N Revised	N Total
Hybrid (Tibial Cemented)	11	205
TOTAL	11	205

TABLE 7**Revision Rates of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Bearing Surface**

This analysis is provided as some prostheses are combined with a variety of bearing surfaces. All bearing surfaces used with this combination are listed.

Table 7: Revised Number of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Bearing Surface

Bearing Surface	N Revised	N Total
Non XLPE	11	205
TOTAL	11	205

TABLE 8**Revision Rates of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Bearing Mobility**

This analysis is provided as some prostheses are combined with a variety of bearing mobilities. All bearing mobilities used with this combination are listed.

Table 8: Revised Number of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Bearing Mobility

Bearing Mobility	N Revised	N Total
Rotating	11	205
TOTAL	11	205

TABLE 9**Revision Rates of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Stability**

This analysis is provided as some prostheses are combined with a variety of stabilities. All stabilities used with this combination are listed.

Table 9: Revised Number of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Stability

Stability	N Revised	N Total
Minimally Stabilised	11	205
TOTAL	11	205

TABLE 10**Revision Rates of Primary Total Knee Replacement by State**

This enables a state by state variation to be identified for the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination and provides the comparative data for each of the states for all other total knee prostheses.

The purpose of this analysis is to determine if the higher than anticipated rate of revision has widespread distribution between states. If there is widespread distribution then the reason for the higher than anticipated rate of revision is unlikely to be surgeon specific. If the prosthesis has been used in only a small number of states it is not possible to distinguish if the higher than anticipated rate of revision is related to the prosthesis, surgeon, technique or patient.

Table 10: Revised Number of Primary Total Knee Replacement by State

Component	State	N Revised	N Total
E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd)	NSW	11	205
Other Total Knee	NSW	7539	259292
	VIC	6020	163565
	QLD	5789	167244
	WA	3600	92841
	SA	3220	73114
	TAS	475	15075
	ACT/NT	630	20094
TOTAL		27284	791430

Note: Prostheses no longer used in 2025 are excluded from the comparator.

TABLE 11**Number of Revisions of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Year of Implant**

This analysis details the number of prostheses reported each year to the Registry for the E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) total knee combination. It also provides the subsequent number of revisions of the primaries reported in that year.

Primary procedures performed in later years have had less follow up time therefore the number revised is expected to be less than the number revised in earlier years. For example, a primary procedure performed in 2025 has a maximum of one year to be revised, whereas a primary procedure performed in 2023 has a maximum of three years to be revised.

Table 11: Number of Revisions of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Year of Implant

Year of Implant	Number Revised	Total Number
2014	0	1
2015	0	6
2017	0	6
2018	0	24
2019	2	24
2020	3	36
2021	2	29
2022	1	23
2023	3	36
2024	0	20
TOTAL	11	205

TABLE 12

Revision Rates of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Catalogue Number Range

Many prostheses have a number of catalogue ranges. The catalogue range is specific to particular design features; more than one catalogue range usually indicates a minor difference in design in a particular E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) prosthesis.

This analysis has been undertaken to determine if the revision rate varies according to the catalogue number range.

Model	Catalogue Range	Catalogue Description	Cement	Coating
Femoral				
E.Motion	NO582K-NO688K	FP/UC CEMENTLESS FEMORAL COMPONENT	NO	HA COATED
Tibial				
E.Motion Pro	NX731K-NX788K	UC/PS CEMENTED PRO MODULAR TIBIAL COMPONENT	YES	

Table 12: Revised Number of E.Motion (cless)/E.Motion Pro (ctd) Primary Total Knee Replacement by Catalogue Number Range

Femoral Range	Tibial Range	N Revised	N Total
NO582K-NO688K	NX731K-NX788K	11	205
TOTAL		11	205