

TABLE E-1 Comparison with Results of Published Studies on Both Mobile-Bearing and Fixed-Plateau Knees at Twelve Years

Author	Knee Type	Estimated Survival Rate at 12 Years	Definition of Failure	Age at Time of Surgery* (yr)	Follow-up Compliance
Diduch et al. <sup>30</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented posterior stabilized	87%	Revision of femoral, tibial, or patellar component or exchange of spacer	51 (22-55)	Not reported
Sorrells et al. <sup>38</sup>	Mobile-bearing, uncemented rotating platform	88.1%	Revision for any reason	56 (28-64)	Not reported
Scuderi et al. <sup>31</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented total condylar	90.56%	Revision (or recommendation for revision) of prosthesis for any reason	67 (20-87)	Not reported
Font-Rodriguez et al. <sup>32</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented total condylar	90.77%	Revision (or recommendation for revision) of prosthesis for any reason	66.5 (17-87)	Not reported
	Fixed plateau; cemented posterior stabilized; all-polyethylene tibial component	94.1%			Not reported
	Fixed plateau; cemented posterior stabilized; metal-backed tibial component	98.1%			Not reported
Stern and Insall <sup>26</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented posterior stabilized	93.6%	Revision for any reason	63 (17-87)	Not reported
Gill et al. <sup>27</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented total condylar	98.6%	Revision for any reason	61 (30-80)	Not reported
Ranawat et al. <sup>28</sup>	Fixed plateau, cemented total condylar	98.96%	Revision for any reason	65 (31-79)	Not reported
Buechel et al. <sup>8</sup>	Mobile-bearing; uncemented rotating platform; patients without previous knee surgery	98.3%	Revision for any mechanical reason, including component loosening, bearing wear, bearing dislocation, instability	67 (23-87)	Not reported
Callaghan et al. <sup>7</sup>	Mobile-bearing, cemented rotating platform	100%	Revision for any reason	70 (37-88)	Not reported
Current study	Mobile-bearing, uncemented rotating platform	89.5%	Revision for any reason	69 (29-98)	90.7%

\*The values are given as the mean, with the range in parentheses.