SmithNephew Knee solutions

Personalization · Versatility · Performance





- Flexible surgical execution with **Burr and Saw** options
- **Compact and mobile** robotic-assisted system compared to competitors^{†3}
- Flexibility to perform **partial, primary and revision knees,** all robotically-enabled





JOURNEY^OII Total Knee Arthroplasty with OXINIUM^o Technology

	27.
	/н
	n II
No.	LLL,

Shown to reproduce the **kinematics** of a normal knee^{‡4-8}



Demonstrated to restore the **anatomical shape and joint line** of the patient⁹⁻¹²

al

Exhibited **significant improvements in Knee Society Scores** at 1-year compared to other TKA designs^{10,13}



LEGION[¢] CONCELOC[¢] Cementless Total Knee System



Demonstrated high survivorship and significantly improved patient reported outcomes^{++26,27}

Cementless TKA supports efficiency in the $\mathbf{OR}^{\ddagger 28}$



JOURNEY[©] II UK Unicompartmental Knee System with OXINIUM[®] Technology



Designed to give surgeons the flexibility to **optimize** the construct for **each patient's unique anatomy**¹⁴



UKA with CORI[®] System has been shown to provide **improved joint line restoration** and **higher patient satisfaction**^[15-18]



Robotic UKA has shown to decrease the risk of revision by 17%^{§19-23}



LEGION^O RK Revision Knee System with OXINIUM^O Technology



Image-free joint line referencing with CORI System enabling anatomic replication²⁹



Comprehensive implant options enabling a **personalized fit**

LEGION Revision with OXINIUM Technology demonstrated **excellent survivorship at 15 years**³⁰ *Any alignment refers to kinematic, functional and mechanical alignment

†Compared to MAKO™ and ROSA™

‡Based on BCS and CR evidence

"Evidence based on JOURNEY[®] family implants; Compared to conventional UKA

§Based on general robotic UKA evidence; Compared to conventional UKA

**Shown in a validated, ovine model

++Compared to preoperative scores at one year follow-up

#Based on general cementless TKA evidence, when compared to cemented TKA

Products may not be available in all markets because product availability is subject to the regulatory and/or medical practices in individual markets. Please contact your Smith+Nephew representative or distributor if you have questions about the availability of Smith+Nephew products in your area. For detailed product information, including indications for use, contraindications, precautions and warnings, please consult the product's applicable Instructions for Use (IFU) prior to use.

Smith & Nephew, Inc. 1450 Brooks Road	www.smith-nephew.com	⁰Trademark of Smith+Nephew. All trademarks acknowledged.
Memphis, TN 38116		©2025 Smith+Nephew.
USA		All rights reserved.
		46402 V1 01/25

References

1. Smith+Nephew 2022. Optimus TKA Tensioner Gap Assessment Verification Report. Internal Report. 10059269. 2. Smith+Nephew 2021. Tensioner Design Verification Test Report. Internal Report. TR100123. 3. Smith+Nephew 2020. Comparison of operating room footprint for robotic-assisted knee arthroplasty systems. Internal Report. EO.REC.PCS015.002.v1. 4. Iriuchishima T, Ryu K. A Comparison of Rollback Ratio between Bicruciate Substituting Total Knee Arthroplasty and Oxford Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty. J Knee Surg. 2018;31(6):568-572 5. Murakami K, Hamai S, Okazaki K, et al. Knee kinematics in bi-cruciate stabilized total knee arthroplasty during squatting and stairclimbing activities. J Orthop. 2018;15(2):650-654. 6. Carpenter RD, Brilhault J, Majumdar S, Ries MD. Magnetic resonance imaging of in vivo patellofemoral kinematics after total knee arthroplasty. Knee. 2009;16(5):332-336. 7. Grieco TF, Sharma A, Dessinger GM, Cates HE, Komistek RD. In Vivo Kinematic Comparison of a Bicruciate Stabilized Total Knee Arthroplasty and the Normal Knee Using Fluoroscopy. J Arthroplasty. 2018;33(2):565-571. 8. Smith LA, Nachtrab J, LaCour M, et al. In Vivo Knee Kinematics: How Important Are the Roles of Femoral Geometry and the Cruciate Ligaments? J Arthroplasty. 2021;36:1445-1454. 9. Mayman DJ, Patel AR, Carroll KM. Hospital Related Clinical and Economic Outcomes of a Bicruciate Knee System in Total Knee Arthroplasty Patients. Poster presented at: ISPOR Symposium; 19-23 May, 2018; Baltimore, Maryland, USA. 10. Nodzo SR, Carroll KM, Mayman DJ. The Bicruciate Substituting Knee Design and Initial Experience. Tech Orthop. 2018;33(1):37-41. 11. Murakami K, Hamai S, Okazaki K, et al. In vivo kinematics of gait in posteriorstabilized and bicruciate-stabilized total knee arthroplasties using image-matching techniques. Int Orthop. 2018;42(11):2573-2581. 12. Di Benedetto P, Vidi D, Colombo, Buttironi MM, Cainero V, Causero A. Pre-operative and post-operative kinematic analysis in total knee arthroplasty. A pilot study. Acta Biomed. 2019;90:91-97. 13. Lutes W, Fitch D. Comparison of functional outcomes following total knee arthroplasty with a conventional implant design or one designed to mimic natural knee kinematics. Presented at: 39th SICOT Orthopaedic World Congress; October 10-13, 2018; Montréal, Canada. 14. Smith+Nephew 2020. 23448 V1 JOURNEY II UK Design Rationale. 15. Ashok Kumar PS, Pawar S, Kanniyan K, et al. Does robotic assisted unicompartmental knee arthroplasty restore native joint line more accurately than with conventional instruments? J Robot Surg. 2024;18(1):49. 16. Negrin R, Duboy J, Iniguez M, et al. Roboticassisted vs conventional surgery in medial unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: a clinical and radiological study. Knee Surg Relat Res. 2021;33(1):5. 17. Negrin R, Duboy J, Reyes NO, et al. Robotic-assisted Unicompartmental knee Arthroplasty optimizes joint line restitution better than conventional surgery. J Exp Orthop. 2020;7(1):94. 18. Mergenthaler G, et al. Is robotic-assisted unicompartmental knee arthroplasty a safe procedure? A case control study. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2021;29:931–938.2023. 19. Smith PN, et al. Hip, Knee and Shoulder Arthroplasty: 2023 Annual Report, Australian Orthopaedic Association National Joint Replacement Registry, AOA: Adelaide, South Australia. 2023. https://doi.org/10.25310/YWQZ9375. 20. Chen K, et al. In: Lonner JH, editor. Robotics in Knee and Hip Arthroplasty: Springer; 2019. 21. Allen MW, Jacofsky DJ. In: Lonner JH editor. Robotics in Knee and Hip Arthroplasty: Springer; 2019. 22. Karia M, Masjedi M, Andrews B, et al. Robotic Assistance Enables Inexperienced Surgeons to Perform Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasties on Dry Bone Models with Accuracy Superior to Conventional Methods. Adv Orthop. 2013;2013:481039. 23. Jacofsky DJ, Allen M. Robotics in Arthroplasty: A Comprehensive Review. J Arthroplasty. 2016;31:2353–2363. 24. Fenwick S, et al. World Biomaterials Congress; May 28–June 1, 2008; Amsterdam, NL. 25. Smith+Nephew 2015. NCS249. 26. Laende EK, Gascoyne TC, Teeter MG, et al. Poster presented at Orthopaedic Research Society 2024 Annual Meeting, February 2–6, 2024; Long Beach, CA, USA. 27. Prinos A, Cardillo c, Greenky S, et al. Poster presented at Orthopaedic Research Society 2024 Annual Meeting, February 2–6, 2024; Long Beach, CA, USA. 28. Liu Z, Wen L, Zhou L, et al. Comparison of Cemented and Cementless Fixation in Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis and Systematic Review of RCTs. J Orthop Surg. 2024;32(3):1-12. 29. Cochrane NH, Kim BI, Stauffer TP, et al. Revision total knee arthroplasty with an imageless, second-generation robotic system. J Arthroplasty. Published online February 12, 2024. 30. National Joint Registry for England, Wales and Northern Ireland: LEGION revision OXINIUM (with revision tibial) implant summary report. 13 November 2025.