

Budget impact of the VELYS™ robotic-assisted solution compared to manual procedure in patients undergoing primary total knee arthroplasty in France

EE112

Jean-Baptiste Trouiller¹, Paul Bourras¹, Vito Paragò²

¹Johnson & Johnson Medical, Paris, France
²Johnson & Johnson Medical S.p.A., Pratica di Mare, Italy

Introduction

- Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA) is one of the most common orthopaedic procedures worldwide¹, with over 100,000 procedures performed in France in 2022.²
- Despite TKA being so common, up to 22.2% of patients indicate that they are not satisfied with their TKA one-year post-operatively.³
- Robotic TKA (rTKA) can improve implant alignment and positioning compared to manual TKA^{4,5} as well as some studies have found that rTKA may reduce patient pain in the early post-operative period compared to manual TKA (mTKA)[#].⁶
- VELYS™ Robotic-Assisted Solution (VRAS) is designed to help support precision and accuracy without the need for pre-operative imaging[#] ⁷⁻¹⁰ and facilitates a patient specific alignment, which may improve patient reported outcome measures[#].¹¹⁻¹⁴
- However, studies investigating the economic impact of VRAS remain limited in European countries due to its novelty.

[#]Product(s) may not be commercially available in all markets. This content may not be used externally in those markets where regulatory approval has not been granted for all the products referenced.

Objective

The objective of this study was to assess the budget impact of VRAS compared to manual TKA (mTKA) in patients undergoing primary TKA from both the hospital and the payer perspective in France.

Methods

- We developed a **budget impact model** inclusive of all relevant potential primary TKA resources to estimate costs of primary TKA over **7 years**, corresponding to the robot lifespan.
- Two payer perspectives in **France** were used in this analysis: **Hospital perspective** and **Payer perspective**.
- The model assumed **250 patients/year** (1,750 patients, total) undergoing primary TKA for end-stage knee osteoarthritis.
- Clinical inputs, cost and resource use** were collected from literature, public databases and expert opinion (Table 1).

Table 1. Clinical inputs and resource use and cost inputs

	Scenario without VRAS	Scenario with VRAS
Surgery costs [§]		
Overall cost (€/patient)	904	1,674
Hospital resource use [§]		
Length of stay (days) ¹⁵	4.02	2.85* (Reduced by 29% ¹⁶)
Cost per length of stay (€/day) ¹⁷		476
Trays sterilized†	8	4
Sterilization cost (€/tray) ¹⁸		70
Post-Hospital resource use†		
Annual revision risk ¹⁹	0.68%	0.48% * (Reduced by 30% ²⁰)
Revision cost** (€) ²¹		9,734
3-month knee-related revisit rate ²²	4.81%	2.65%
Knee-related revisit cost** (€) ²³		19
3-month knee-related readmission rate ²²	1.46%	0.69%
Knee-related readmission cost** (€) ²⁴		7,987
Physiotherapy visits after primary TKA ²⁵	11	6
Physiotherapy cost** (€/visit) ²⁶		16.62

* Calculated on basis of reported reduction rate

**Based on official reimbursement DRG tariff

†Expert opinion


§Hospital perspective only

‡Payer perspective only

Results

Hospital perspective


- From the hospital perspective, the adoption of VRAS had a cumulative **savings of -€112,366 by year 7** (Fig. 1), for mean savings of -€64/patient over the time horizon.
- An annual total savings of -€16,052 are seen from Year 1 onwards (Fig. 1).



Payer perspective

- From the payer perspective, the adoption of VRAS had a cumulative **cost savings of -€388,669** (Fig. 2) and a mean savings of -€222/patient over the time horizon.
- The annual cost savings increased in magnitude from -€41,085 in Year 1 to -€69,684 in Year 7 (Fig. 2).

Figure 2. Cumulative and annual budget impact – Payer perspective




References

1. Le Stum M, Le Goff-Pronost M, Stindel E, Dardenne G (2025) Incidence rate of total knee arthroplasties in eleven European countries: Do they reach a plateau? PLOS ONE 20(1): e0312701.
2. PMSI Data 2022 - ATIH
3. Mueritzha M, Cai X, Ji B, Amali A, Cao L. Factors contributing to 1-year dissatisfaction after total knee arthroplasty: a nomogram prediction model. J Orthop Surg Res. 2022 Jul 28;17(1):367.
4. Chin BZ, Tan SSH, Chua KCX, Budiono GR, Syn NL, O'Neill GK. Robot-Assisted versus Conventional Total and Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-analysis of Radiological and Functional Outcomes. J Knee Surg. 2020.
5. Doan GW, Courts RP, Wyss JG, Green EW, Clary CW. Image-Free Robotic-Assisted Total Knee Arthroplasty Improves Implant Alignment Accuracy: A Cadaveric Study. J Arthroplasty. 2022; 37(4): p. 795-801.
6. Agarwal N, To K, McDonnell S, Khan W. Clinical and Radiological Outcomes in Robotic-Assisted Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Arthroplasty. 2020 Nov;35(11):3393-3409.
7. DePuy Synthes. ROBONY Cadaveric Accuracy and Soft Tissue Study. 14 Dec 2021. Windchill #103720852.
8. DePuy Synthes. Robony Design Rationale. Windchill #103672172.
9. Altan T, Severson E, Ford W, Leslie J, Lesko J, Delavero R. Assessment of Accuracy and Early Outcomes During the Adoption Phase of a Novel Image-Free Robotic-Assisted System for Total Knee Arthroplasty. British Orthopaedics Association, Sept 2023. Poster #376.
10. Hallak A, Schichman I, Benady A, Warschawski Y, Gold A, Snir N. Accuracy of a Novel Imageless Guided Robotic System Using Patient-Specific Alignment. American Association of Hip and Knee Surgeons 2023.Poster #355.
11. Clatworthy M. Patient-Specific TKA with the VELYS Robotic-Assisted Solution. Surg Technol Int. 2022; 40.
12. Calless T, Bauer K, Stukenborg-Colsman C, Windhagen H, Budde S, Ettinger M. PSI kinematic versus non PSI mechanical alignment in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective randomized study. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2016;DOI 10.1007/s00107-016-4136-8.
13. Dossett HG, Estrada NA, Swartz GJ, LeFevre GW, et al. A randomised controlled trial of kinematically and mechanically aligned total knee replacements. BoneJoint J. 2014;907-913.
14. Clatworthy M. Outcome & Survival Analysis of Conventional Measured Resection, Neutral Alignment Attune TKA vs CAS Anatomic Tibia, Balanced Femur, Constitutional Alignment Attune TKA. Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine, 2017. 5(5_suppl5): p. 232996711750015.
15. PMSI Data 2024 (TKA - procedure codes = NFKA007 ou NFKA008) Length of Stay 2024.

Cost breakdown

- In the scenario with VRAS, there were higher surgery costs (including direct VRAS expenses, disposable and operating theatre) over the 7-year time horizon (€771/patient) (Fig. 3).
- Lower costs were observed for all other categories, with a major **reduction in hospitalization costs of -€555/patient**, translating to **-€971K for all patients** (Fig. 3).

Figure 3. Costs breakdown for each patient over 7 years



Resource use breakdown

Cost savings over the 7-year time horizon in the scenario with VRAS derive from considerable reductions in

- surgical trays
- healthcare interactions (revisions, revisits, readmissions, and physiotherapy sessions)
- duration of hospital stays (Table 2).

Table 2. Resource use savings in the scenario with VRAS

Resource	Scenario with VRAS
Number of bed days saved	2,040
Number of trays saved	7,000
Number of physiotherapy sessions avoided*	8,663
Number of revisits avoided*	38
Number of readmissions avoided*	14
Number of revisions avoided*	14

*Payer perspective only

Conclusion

Over a 7-year time horizon, VRAS rTKA was found to reduce overall costs and resource use compared to mTKA under both hospital and payer perspectives in France. The largest cost-saver was the reduction in hospitalization costs.

16. Severson E, Tan Z, English A, Reimer J, Goldstein L, Etter K. Healthcare resource utilization for VELYS™ robotic-assisted solution compared to manual surgery for total knee arthroplasty. J Robot Surg. 2025 Aug 31;19(1):539. doi: 10.1007/s11701-025-02510-2. PMID: 40886191; PMCID: PMC12399716.
17. Radcliffe G, Trouiller JB, Battaglia S, Larraínzar-Garjón R. Cost-effectiveness and budget impact of cement augmentation for the fixation of unstable trochanteric fractures from a European perspective: Cost-effectiveness and budget impact of cement augmentation in Europe. Injury. 2024 Dec;55(12):111995. doi: 10.1016/j.injury.2024.111999. Epub 2024 Nov 10. PMID: 3955084.
18. Bouthors C, Nguyen J, Durand L, Dubory A, Raspaud S, Court C. Single-use versus reusable medical devices in spinal fusion surgery: a hospital micro-costing analysis. Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol. 2019 Dec;29(8):1631-1637. Epub (2015) Inferred to 2024.
19. Burn E, Prieto-Alhambra D, Hamilton TW, Kennedy JA, Murray DW, Pinedo-Villanueva R. Threshold for Computer- and Robot-Assisted Knee and Hip Replacements in the English National Health Service. Value Health. 2020 Jun;23(6):719-726. doi: 10.1016/j.jval.2019.11.011. Epub 2020 May 25. PMID: 32540229.
20. The Dental and Pharmaceutical Benefits Agency. Health economic assessment done on VELYS™ Robotic-Assisted Solution.Dnr 3598/2023.
21. Average DRG tariff: GHS_08C22 (tarifs GHS issus de la campagne tarifaire 2024 – JO 2024/ Données nombre de séjour PMSI 2024 - ATIH)
22. Huang P, Cross M, Gupta A, Intwala D, Ruppenkamp J, Hoeffel D. Early Clinical and Economic Outcomes for the VELYS Robotic-Assisted Solution Compared with Manual Instrumentation for Total Knee Arthroplasty. The journal of knee surgery. 10.1055/a-2343-2445.
23. Tariff consultation <https://www.sevirobe-public.fr/publications/vosdroits/F170424?~:text=M%C3%A9decin%20convention%C3%A9%20%2D%20Secteur%201,le%20forfait%20de%20%2E2%82%AC>.
24. JO 2024: DRG tariff revision - severity level 1
25. Kayaani B, Konan S, Tahmassebi J, Pietrzak JRT, Haddad FS. Robotic-arm assisted total knee arthroplasty is associated with improved early functional recovery and reduced time to hospital discharge compared with conventional jig-based total knee arthroplasty: a prospective cohort study. Bone Joint J. 2018 Jul;100-B(7):930-937.
26. NGAP +Health Insurance → Coefficient 7.52 (Rehabilitation following total or unicompartmental knee arthroplasty) Coefficient: 7.52 - 2025 rate: € 2.21 - Total fee: € 6.62 + Travel allowance: € 0.38 per kilometer

Acknowledgements
Medical writing support was provided by Amaris Consulting.

